

THE AMERICAN REVIEW:

DEVOTED TO
POLITICS AND LITERATURE.

VOL. I.

JANUARY, 1848.

NO. I.

PROSPECTUS OF THE NEW SERIES.

NEXT to the interest which our friends felt in the beginning of this enterprise, must be their desire to have recorded, its successful establishment. The patrons of the American Review, who generously and patriotically aided its first struggles into life, may be desirous of knowing its present position and future intentions. A sad decree has forbidden the hand that should have made the record.

The experience of three years, with the counsel and advice of many able and judicious friends, had determined the Editor to begin a new Series of his Journal, upon a more liberal scale of expenditure, and with an infusion of greater vigor and attention in every department. The proper conduct of the whole was found to surpass the abilities of any one person, and a greater outlay became necessary to obtain the requisite aid. The price paid for valuable articles, though it already exceeded what the finances would bear, had to be increased, that none but good material might be used. The political department, especially, it was found, must be improved in quantity, and the standard of the best maintained.

To the accomplishment of these ends, it was necessary that the subscription list should be increased.

Were it possible to explain the difficulties, delays, and losses, which attend the collection of the dues of such a journal, reducing the average value of its subscriptions by more than a third, the friends of the Review would find less difficulty in understanding why all the necessary improvements were not sooner made. They have been kept constantly in view, but are the work of much time, and of the joint labor and enthusiasm of many persons.

In the midst of these plans, and in the bloom and vigor of his youth, the generous spirit who strove to execute them, and thereby to deserve well of his country, was cut off by a severe and lingering illness; but as he was a man free in his confidences, and loving to make common cause with many, he left those behind him who had taken an equal interest in the work, and had advised and strenuously labored with him for its accomplishment: it was their part, therefore, to make this statement, both for the regard they bear his memory, and for the duty they owe to the friends and supporters of the enterprise.

It has always been borne in mind that a truly national journal must represent the spirit and principles of the Nation, in its best moods, and as they appear in the

wisdom of its earlier lawgivers. In every free nation, two great parties have arisen, tending towards opposite extremes. Differing in this particular from all ancient, and even from modern European nations, that we are not composed of an inferior, politically mingled, and sharing power with a superior race—a commonalty with an aristocracy—both parties, with us, profess to sustain liberty and the common right. In the spirit and heart of the nation there can be no division. The nation, as a body, extends freedom—political, social, and religious—to all men equally; and out of this spring all our national and political peculiarities.

Yet it will happen, for the most part, that even in pursuit of a good, men are easily misled and deceived into radical extremes.

The friends and conductors of this journal incline not, therefore, hastily to despise and subvert the institutions of our fathers. They mean to abide by the Constitution.

They believe that reforms should in all cases grow from, and be limited by, necessity; and that the State, like any natural organization, should gradually shape itself, by a healthy and spontaneous growth.

They believe that the designers and supporters of schemes of conquest, to be carried on by this government, are engaged in *treason* to our Constitution and Declaration of Rights, giving "aid and comfort" to the enemies of republicanism, in that they are advocating and preaching the doctrine of "the right of conquest." These traitors to all humanity, and to God, must be met and vanquished, or the principle which sustains us, as a nation, will be subverted.

In meeting and discussing new phases of opinion, they will favor with their whole heart and mind, all plans for the amelioration of society, and all such new ideas of social and physical science, as seem to have their foundation in nature and experience. Yet they can never forget that truth is old, and the principles of human nature, like the moral law, by no means a discovery of yesterday.

In questions of political economy, they

will not suffer themselves to be led by the example of any other nation, into advocating measures suitable, perhaps, to that nation, but unsuitable and injurious to our own; believing that a judicious regard to the circumstances of a people, should govern its legislation.

In a choice of rulers and legislators, they mean to sustain such men as seem fitted to represent, not the will only, but the virtue and common sense of their constituents.

That the power of the Executive be restricted within its just limits, they will strenuously urge.

That the rights and power of the States be preserved inviolate, as the sole defence of the individual against Executive usurpation, they will also advocate; but no less, that individual States be not suffered to impair the high privileges of the citizen, in his relation to the nation as a whole.

That every means be employed to prevent the converting of offices into political agencies, for corrupting and subverting the popular will.

In brief, the conductors of this journal are Whigs, in principle and practice, and mean to use it, as far as in them lies, for the promotion of that cause.

As a vehicle of opinion to reach all classes of intelligent persons, it has been found necessary to regard the interests of general literature in the REVIEW, equally with those of politics—the two being necessary to each other.

In regard to sectional questions, a journal professing to be purely national must either avoid them, or discuss them in the light of general policy and morality: indifference to the decision of such questions would betray either an immoral, or an imbecile spirit.

Enough, perhaps, has been said on former occasions, of the importance of a truly national organ of opinion, whose purpose should be to promote union and singleness of principle in the Whig party. The sole desire of the conductors of this journal is, that it may in some measure satisfy the want that is felt for such an organ.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—THE WAR.

As often as the President comes before the nation with a new manifesto in regard to the unhappy war, in which, by his own deliberate, unauthorized and criminal act, he has involved the country, no choice is left us, as the faithful conductors of a journal of American politics, but to follow him to this well-trodden field—to set up there, again and again, in the face of the American people and of the world, the lofty standard of historic truth, of international law, of real justice and honor, and of true national renown and glory, against the wretched perversions, the false glosses and miserable plausibilities in which this high functionary of the government habitually indulges, whenever he comes before the country to justify himself for the great Measure of Blood and Conquest by which he has undertaken to signalize his administration. If truth, as affecting the highest question of national concern, have not lost all value, it must be defended even against the mistakes or perversions of a President of the United States. Nay, this duty becomes doubly important and imperative in such a case, on account of the authority which attaches to his lofty position. And he must not be allowed to use his eminent station to indoctrinate the people of this country in any false principles, whether of the law of nations or the law of national justice and honor. He must not be allowed to seduce the American people from the allegiance which they owe to a higher law than any which the kings or rulers of this earth can impose or teach—the law of right and of duty—the law which has its sanction in the consciences of men, and its seat in the bosom of God.

Of course, we are not weak enough to expect anything less than that the President should continue, at every opportunity, to put forth all his own energies, and all the energies he can buy or borrow for the purpose, in defence of his original crime in plunging this country into an unnecessary

war. It is his fate also, in order to render his attempts at justification any way plausible, that he must take care to make all his subsequent conduct and acts as consistent as possible, in error and criminality, with his original offences. Beginning wrong, which he is resolved never to acknowledge, he must continue to go wrong, sinking deeper and deeper at every step, until he becomes involved in difficulties from which he is obliged to confess he sees no certain way of escape. Precisely as, on the one hand, the path of the just shines brighter and brighter to the perfect day, so, on the other, does that path in which the President has chosen to walk, darken, at every remove, into thicker and more palpable gloom. On this point, his recent Annual Message to Congress, when rightly understood, exhibits the most melancholy proof. Of course, it is passably ingenious, adroit and plausible. But it is not difficult to unravel and expose its plausibilities. And it is a bold document, because no other tone would suit, at all, the condition of desperate hazard to which he has been brought in the legitimate progress of the game he undertook to play. The most timid are known to become brave, when all retreat from danger is found to be cut off. In this instance, however, the bold tone of the Message is not sufficient to hide altogether that terrible conflict of secret emotions which, we doubt not, has been going on all the while in the heart and conscience of its author.

The President undertook to make a *little* war. He has found it a great and terrible war. He ordered an army to invade the Mexican State of Tamaulipas, then in the undisputed and undisturbed occupation of its Mexican inhabitants; and he did this with the expectation and belief, that a military demonstration of this sort, perhaps with a single collision of arms, just sufficient to manifest our undoubted superiority in war, would be enough to bring Mexico to such compliance and concessions, as would

enable him to illustrate his political rule by the acquisition of some portion of the coveted lands of that unhappy country. In this he was disappointed. Mr. Slidell, his envoy to that republic, writing from its capital, in the first month of his visit there, and mistaking in like manner the character of that people, strongly recommended to the President the virtue of "hostile demonstrations," as necessary to quicken them to the proper labors of negotiation. To his surprise, no doubt, Mr. Polk found that Mexicans would fight when their homes and country were invaded. Still he believed they would be overawed by "hostile demonstrations" on a more formidable scale. As soon as it was known at Washington that a collision of arms had taken place, with disastrous results to a small body of our gallant dragoons, he recommended to Congress "the immediate appearance in arms of a large and overpowering force, as the most certain and efficient means of bringing the existing collision with Mexico to a speedy and successful termination." He was promptly authorized to call fifty thousand volunteers into the field, and to employ the whole army and navy of the United States in the war.

Thus the country was precipitated into the war so recklessly provoked and begun by the Executive. Battles were fought and victories won in unbroken succession, but peace was not obtained. And at the end of every ensuing engagement, successful in all things, except in bringing submission and peace, the President promised himself that the next battle and victory, and the next, and the next, would certainly issue in the wished-for triumph. They brought nothing but disappointment. More men were called for; blood was poured out like water; more battles and more glorious victories were achieved; half a dozen States and Territories were overrun; still we had not "conquered a peace." With every new success, which was only a new disappointment, the cry was raised—"The war must be more vigorously prosecuted." It was prosecuted just so vigorously as to enable our gallant soldiers always to win desperate battles, against fearful odds, by the most incredible efforts, and the most awful sacrifice of life. Our army performed prodigies of valor, challenging, by their gallant deeds, the amazement and admiration of the

world. And so our victorious arms were carried up to the gates of the proud capital of the Mexican empire. And then there was a magnanimous pause, to receive the submission of the enemy. He was humbled, but he was not subdued. He would yield much, but he would not yield all. The President had imposed on himself the necessity of making his demands large, that they might seem to bear some proper proportion to the magnitude of the war. He had begun a little war, upon a despised enemy, who was to be terrified into submission, by "the appearance in arms of a large and overpowering force." It had grown into a great war, that tasked the vast resources and the full energies of the nation to carry it on. The very policy, indeed, which proposed to strike terror into the heart of the enemy by a formidable show of force, created the necessity of making the war in fact a formidable one, from the moment it was found that the mere demonstration was a failure. And the prosecution of such a formidable war created, in its turn, a sort of necessity of bringing out results of corresponding magnitude, far beyond anything having reference merely to the original matters of difference between the two countries. When our victorious army stood before the gates of the enemy's capital, in the heart of his dominions, there was no longer a question about the original grounds of quarrel. They were yielded by Mexico. She agreed to give up her pretensions to Texas, which had been annexed to the United States, and which she had heretofore insisted on regarding as her own revolted province, in spite of its declared independence, and its political union with this country. And she agreed, also, to give us ample indemnity in territory, more than enough to cover the claims of our citizens upon her justice, which thus far she had failed to pay. These were the main original points of difference, and formed the only original subjects of complaint or demand we had to make against Mexico. They were now yielded—as they would have been yielded by negotiation, without any war at all, if only a little forbearance and a little wisdom had been exercised in regard to them. The whole country is aware of this, and can never be convinced to the contrary. And hence it was, that after having prosecuted

such a formidable, costly and desolating war, up to the walls of the Mexican capital, for no necessary causes of dispute whatever between Mexico and us, the President found or deemed it necessary to turn his back upon the false pretences he had constantly set up and insisted on, as inducing and justifying hostilities, and to make such demands for the dismemberment of the Mexican empire as, if yielded on her part, might gratify the pride and supposed rapacity of his countrymen, and win for the war an unjustifiable and dishonest popular approval. This, of course, put peace out of the question. Negotiations were broken off, because Mexico would not consent to the dismemberment proposed to her. An unnecessary war had led to the making of an iniquitous and exorbitant demand, to which Mexico would not submit. The conflict was resumed. More battles were fought; the best blood of the country flowed again like water; the capital of the enemy was entered, sword in hand, and Mexico is conquered!

Yes, Mexico is conquered, but she is not yet subdued, and we have not yet "conquered a peace." Mexico is no nearer submission, now that her capital is in our hands, than the United States were, when, in the Revolution, the enemy had possession of New-York and Philadelphia. She is no nearer submission than Russia was, when Napoleon was in Moscow. And it is at this very point, that the difficulties and embarrassments of the President on account of this war, are become most formidable and inextricable. At the end of campaigns as completely successful, so far as military operations are concerned, as any that Alexander or Napoleon ever prosecuted, he finds himself in a state of most distressing perplexity. He can neither go forward nor retreat, with any prospect of satisfaction. The last field of glory in this war, was reaped when the city of Mexico was taken. Henceforth, there can be no grand fighting, no glorious victories. What remains is a war of details, a defensive war against guerrillas, and assassins, and the *romito*. A few minor cities and places may yet be assailed and taken; but there can be no grand forward movement. As a war of movement and of conquest, it is over. And as the President holds retreat to be impossible, so long as Mexico refuses to consent to the

terms he has prescribed for her dismemberment, and as there is not the slightest chance that Mexico will ever consent to anything of the sort, a state of embarrassment has arisen, which might well fill the Executive with distress and alarm. How he proposes to deal with the case, since he is forced to meet it in some way, we shall see in the progress of this article. Suffice it here to say, that he meets the case with a proposition as daring, reckless, and profligate, as any that ever characterized the proceedings of the most celebrated among the professed conquerors and spoilers of ancient or modern times; and so we shall demonstrate the fact to be, before we have done with the subject.

Our readers must be made aware, if they are not so already, of the significant and important fact, now officially disclosed, that the war assumed an entirely new phase from the termination of the negotiations between Mr. Trist and the Mexican Commissioners. From that period, it became EXPLICITLY AND WITHOUT DISGUISE, A WAR FOR THE CONQUEST AND DISMEMBERMENT OF MEXICO. The general object had been plain enough to all shrewd observers from the beginning; but it had been made as far as possible a covert object, and had been constantly, not to say impudently, disavowed. Up to that time, other objects of the war had been insisted on, and not without some show of reason, since war had been undertaken. There were the claims of our citizens, which must be secured in some satisfactory form. And, then, Mexico must be made to relinquish her pretensions to Texas, since that country was annexed to the United States. There was, finally, an unsettled question of boundary between Mexico and the State of Texas, which Mexico must be made to consent to negotiate about and settle, before we could make a definitive peace with her. These were the subjects of difference between the two countries at the breaking out of the war, and the only subjects of difference. Of course they formed, so far as had been avowed at any time, the objects, and the only objects, of the war on our part.

Now we desire to ask, and to ask very emphatically, what remained of these objects of the war, after the conferences between the American and Mexican Commissioners before the walls of the Mexican

capital? Looking steadily at these as the only subjects of difference between the two nations, and the only legitimate and avowed objects of the war on our part, what was Mr. Trist, as the Commissioner of the United States, authorized, or rather what should he have been authorized of right, to demand of the Mexican Government, in regard to them? His legitimate demands would have been—

1. Ample indemnity for the claims of American citizens on Mexico. 2. The cession, or renunciation, of all claims or pretensions on the part of Mexico, to the proper territory of the State of Texas. 3. An adjustment, on terms of reciprocal fairness, of the boundary between the State of Texas and Mexico.

Now these demands were virtually included in the plan of a Treaty furnished to Mr. Trist at Washington, and presented by him to the Mexican Commissioners. It is not necessary that we should state at this moment, what other and further demands were included in the same document. How, then, did Mexico treat these demands? What answer did she return through her Commissioners? Did she refuse all concessions on all or any of these subjects?

The Mexican Commissioners presented a Counter-Project for a Treaty, which is referred to in the President's Message, as offering terms of a Treaty "wholly inadmissible." We deeply regret to be obliged to say, that this highest official dignitary of the land speaks of this Counter-Project in a manner which is neither warranted by common candor, nor by the clear facts of the case.

One thing at least is not denied in the President's statement of objections to the terms of this Counter-Project; and that is, that it includes a clear cession or renunciation of all claims or pretensions of the Mexican government, to the proper territory of Texas. This is done in the fourth article of the project, which is as follows:—

"The dividing line between the two Republics shall commence in the Gulf of Mexico, three leagues from land, opposite to the southern mouth of the Bay of Corpus Christi, running in a straight line from within the said Bay to the mouth of the river Nueces; thence through the middle of said river in all its course to its source; from the source of the river Nueces shall be traced a straight line until it meets

the present frontier of New Mexico on the east-south-east side; then follow the present boundary of New Mexico on the east, north and west, until this last touches the 37th degree; which will serve as a limit for both Republics from the point in which it touches the said frontier of West of New Mexico to the Pacific Ocean. The Government of Mexico promises not to found any new towns or establish colonies in the tract of land which remains between the river Nueces and the Bravo del Norte."

The line here proposed as a boundary begins with yielding to the United States the State of Texas, just as it had stood as a State or Department of Mexico. It was the same State of Texas, having its south-eastern boundary defined as here described, which had revolted from Mexico, and achieved its independence on the plains of San Jacinto. The line here stated does not, it is true, include any part of Coahuila, or of the State of Tamaulipas, neither of which ever revolted from Mexico, or ever manifested any desire to separate from the Mexican empire. But we repeat that this line yielded to the United States the proper State and territory of Texas. And let it be remembered that we are here referring to this matter, only as it affects the general question of Annexation, and the subject of difficulty and dispute between the countries on account of Annexation. It was this subject of Annexation—as distinct from any mere question of boundary—at which Mexico originally took offence. It was on this account that the Mexican minister in this country, Almonte, demanded his passports and withdrew from the country. It was on this account that Mexico refused to have any further diplomatic intercourse with Mr. Shannan, then our minister near the government of that republic. And it was on this account, and because Mr. Slidell had not come as a special commissioner charged with the particular duty of proposing terms of accommodation in reference to Annexation, that that functionary was not received by the Mexican government. It was this Annexation of Texas that Mexico said originally she should regard as a declaration of war against her, though she acted no further on this declaration than to break up all diplomatic relations with us, and to hold herself aloof as the offended party, who was to be conciliated by a

proper advance on our part. Her rejection of our minister, and which was one subject of complaint by our government, though not perhaps set down distinctly as one cause of war, is referrible mainly to this subject of Annexation.

Now what we mean to say is, that in their Counter-Project of a treaty, the Mexican Commissioners expressly yielded the whole matter of difference or dispute in regard to the general subject of the Annexation of Texas to the United States. Annexation was no longer a subject of complaint, and was no longer to stand in the way of peace and amity between the two countries. And thus we say, one of the original subjects of dispute, and no doubt the main cause leading to a collision of arms, was removed. If there had been no Annexation there would have been no war; there would have been no interruption of diplomatic and friendly relations; there would have been no rejection of our minister, and no marching of troops to the Rio Grande. "The existing war," said the Mexican commissioners in their letter to Mr. Trist, accompanying their counter-project, "has been undertaken solely on account of the territory of the State of Texas, respecting which the North American republic presents as its title the Act of the said State by which it was annexed to the North American confederation, after having proclaimed its independence of Mexico." And they add, after stating that Mexico consents "to the pretensions of the government of Washington to the territory of Texas," that "the cause of the war has disappeared, and the war itself ought to cease, since there is no warrant for its continuance." And undoubtedly they were right to this extent, that so far as this question of Annexation was a cause for the war, that cause did disappear from the moment Mexico had declared herself ready to yield the point, and the United States were no longer at liberty to prosecute the war on account of that question, or for any reason merely incident to it. This object of the war, then, if an object of the war at all, no longer remained after the conferences between the commissioners of the two countries, in September; and when the war was renewed, it was renewed for no object relating to the annexation of Texas to the United States.

The next object of the war, on our part, after it had once been commenced, was to obtain satisfaction, or indemnity, for the claims of our citizens on Mexico, on account of injuries and indignities to their persons and property. These claims were not the cause of the war; it was not undertaken for the redress of these injuries; but the war once begun, it was not to be expected that peace would be made, until these demands should be satisfactorily adjusted.

Now we assert, in the face of the bald and bold statement to the contrary in the President's Message, that the Mexican Commissioners, in their counter-project, did offer an ample indemnity for these claims. It is not true, as the President affirms, that this plan "contained no provision for the payment by Mexico of the just claims of our citizens." There was no offer of payment in money, nor was any such payment in money expected, or desired, by the Administration. But there was indemnity, and just that kind of indemnity after which the government has been looking from the beginning, namely, indemnity in territory.

The whole statement in which the Message indulges on this point, is the most extraordinary, perhaps, that was ever uttered by a high public functionary, in the face of an intelligent country. We know of nothing to compare with it, except, indeed, some other statements of the like character in the same document, and in the President's previous Messages on the same general subject. It would be charitable to believe, if we could, that the President falls into these shocking errors of fact, from the agency and imposition of some unprincipled persons about him, and is to be excused on the ground of utter inattention, or else of absolute want of capacity. If this habit of gross perversion, or of careless statement, is to be indulged in, and tolerated, and if he is really to be held accountable for what appears under his hand, it will soon come to be understood, that a Message of the President of the United States to Congress, is no more to be relied on for its relation of facts, than the most worthless newspaper sheet in the land.

The Message informs Congress and the country, that "the terms of a treaty proposed by the Mexican Commissioners, were wholly inadmissible," among other reasons,

some of which are equally gross, because "it contained no provision for the payment by Mexico of the just claims of our citizens." Standing by itself, this might be taken merely as an assertion that this project of a treaty contained no provision for the *pecuniary* payment of these claims; and if so intended to be understood, the assertion could have had no purpose, but to mislead and confound the intelligence of the general reader, because, from the beginning of this war, the President has had no design or desire, nor the remotest expectation, that these claims should be paid by Mexico in money, or provided for by her in any other way than by the cession of territory to the United States. We must hold the President, therefore, as meaning to deny, by the expression we have quoted, that Mexico had made any offer whatever of indemnity for the claims of our citizens. And he has not left this matter in doubt; for by way of expressly negating the idea that any cession of territory was offered as indemnity for these claims, he proceeds to declare, as showing what he calls "the unreasonable terms proposed by the Mexican Commissioners," that this project of a treaty, amongst other things, "offered to cede to the United States, for a *pecuniary consideration*, that part of Upper California lying north of latitude thirty-seven degrees." He refers to this offer of cession, as among the objectionable and unreasonable things contained in the counter-project of the Mexican Commissioners—a cession to be made "for a *pecuniary consideration*;" and he accuses the Commissioners of having "negotiated as if Mexico were the victorious and not the vanquished party." In short, he means to state, and means that we shall understand him as stating, that while Mexico had the impertinence to endeavor to get a bargain out of us, by offering to sell us land in California for ready money, she refused to give us any indemnity, or any satisfaction whatever, in land or anything else, for the just claims of our citizens. And this statement we are constrained to pronounce utterly at variance with the facts.

It will be observed by the reader that our Commissioner opened the negotiation at the conferences referred to, by presenting to the Mexican Commissioners the draught of a treaty, with which he had

been furnished by our Government, although the President takes pains to inform us, by way of showing with what a dignified and lofty reserve the conference must have been approached on the part of the United States, that Mr. Trist "was not directed to make any new overtures of peace." Nevertheless, he presented the draught of a treaty, the first article of which began with declaring, "There shall be a firm and universal peace between the United States of America, and the United Mexican States," &c. The subsequent articles, of course, set forth the terms upon which the President proposed this lasting and universal peace should rest.

Now it is the particular mode adopted in this draught of a treaty, of reaching the matters of difference and dispute between the two countries, to which we wish to call the attention of the reader, by way of preparing him to understand fully, and without the possibility of mistake, the meaning and intention of the terms subsequently proposed in the Counter-Project of the Mexican Commissioners. He must remember that a main thing was, as the President so strenuously argues, to obtain indemnity for the claims of our citizens by a cession of territory. "Mexico," says the Message, "has no money to pay, and no other means of making the required indemnity. If we refuse this, we can obtain nothing else." This, indeed, was assuming a fact without any warrant of proof. But for the interruption caused by the annexation of Texas, and finally by the war, there cannot be a doubt that every dollar of these claims would have been paid in money. And the President forgets that in this very Message in which he urges the impossibility of squeezing anything out of Mexico, except land, he exults in the prospect of being able to do a good deal towards supporting our vast military operations in that country by the money which shall be collected out of regular Mexican custom house and internal duties, seized into the hands of our officers for that purpose! The internal revenue of Mexico and her Departments, is stated by the Secretary of the Treasury in his recent Report, to have been about thirteen millions of dollars per annum, and the receipts on imports he says have varied from six to twelve millions. And he gives it as his de-

liberate opinion, more than once repeated, that with the ports, and interior, and roads of Mexico in our possession, we may collect from duties on imports as much as Mexico had been used to do; though how much we may gather from internal duties he will not venture to estimate. Here, then, we have the Administration proposing, with apparent candor and good faith, to collect from Mexico, *in the form of regular taxes*, while her principal ports and places shall remain in our military occupation, many more millions annually, in hard gold and silver, for the support of the war, than would suffice to pay every dollar of the claims which our citizens have upon the justice of that country; and at the same time—in the same breath—we have it laid down as a fact—“clear and unquestionable” as our right to Oregon up to fifty-four forty, or as our right to the Rio Grande as a boundary—that Mexico is utterly unable to pay in anything but land! In such miserable and gross contradictions does the rapacious and dishonest policy of the President constantly involve him. He was resolved, from the beginning, to have territory, as much as he could wring from the fears and distresses of that unhappy country—territory conquered in fact, because forced from its unwilling owner by the terror, and, if need be, by the desolation of our arms; but he wished to put a mask on the harsh and bloody features of the abominable transaction, by providing that the forced cession should pass under the fraudulent guise of a necessary indemnity, with a generous offer of payment, of how many millions we know not, for whatever balance of value there might be over and above the indemnity. This was his policy and his resolution, and hence his labored and awkward attempt to make the country believe, at one and the same moment, that taxation in Mexico would give us millions for the support of the war, but could not be made to produce a farthing for the payment of our claims.

But we return to the point of our argument and exposition. A principal thing to be secured in a treaty of peace, was the payment of our claims. This was to be done, as the President insists, only by obtaining a cession of territory. Mr. Trist carried out with him a plan of a treaty which embraced this object; and yet it is just as

true of this plan, as it is of the Counter-Project presented by the Mexican Commissioners, first, that “it contained no provision for the payment by Mexico, of the just claims of our citizens;” and next, that it contained a provision for the cession of territory to the United States “for a pecuniary consideration.” If the Counter-Project was objectionable or offensive, on either of these grounds, the plan presented by Mr. Trist was objectionable and offensive to the United States for the same reasons. The form of reaching both points—indemnity, and the cession of territory—was precisely the same in each case. And more than this: the substance of the several provisions, embracing these two objects, and, to a great extent, the language, was identical in the two projects of a treaty, except only—and this was the only essential difference—as to the amount of territory to be ceded. We here place the articles containing these provisions in juxtaposition on our pages, that they may be read together and easily compared; only premising that the matter inclosed in brackets, in the copy first given, was not, according to the authority of the Washington Union, embraced in the original draught furnished to Mr. Trist.

FROM THE DRAUGHT OF A TREATY PROPOSED
BY MR. TRIST.

ARTICLE IV. The boundary line between the two republics shall commence in the Gulf of Mexico, three leagues from land, opposite the Rio Grande; from thence up the middle of that river to the point where it strikes the southern line of New Mexico; thence westwardly along the southern boundary of New Mexico, to the southwestern corner of the same; thence northward along the western line of New Mexico, until it intersects the first branch of the river Gila, or if it should not intersect any branch of that river, then to the point on the said line nearest to such branch; and thence in a direct line to the same, and down the middle of said branch and of the said river until it empties into the Rio Colorado, and thence downwards by the middle of the Colorado, and the middle of the Gulf of California, to the Pacific Ocean.

ARTICLE V. In consideration of the extension of the boundaries of the United States, as defined by the last preceding article, [and by the stipulations which will appear in article No. 8, the United States abandon, for ever, all claims against the United States of Mexico on account of the expenses of the war] the United States

agree to pay to the United Mexican States, at the city of Vera Cruz, the sum of _____ dollars, in five equal instalments, each of _____ dollars; the first instalment to be paid immediately after this treaty shall have been duly ratified by the government of the United Mexican States.

ARTICLE VI. As a further consideration [of article No. 4] for the extension of the boundaries of the United States, as defined by the fourth article of this treaty, the United States agree to assume and pay to the claimants all the instalments now due, or hereafter to become due, under the convention between the two republics concluded at the city of Mexico on the 30th day of January, 1843, "further to provide for the payment of awards in favor of claimants under the convention between the United States and the Mexican republic, of the 11th April, 1839;" and the United States also agree to assume and pay, to an amount not exceeding three millions of dollars, all claims of citizens of the United States, not heretofore decided against the government of the United Mexican States, which may have arisen previous to the 13th of May, 1846, and shall be found to be justly due by a board of commissioners, to be established by the government of the United States, whose awards shall be final and conclusive: provided, that in deciding upon the validity of these claims, the board shall be guided and governed by the principles and rules of decision prescribed by the first and fifth articles of the unratified convention, concluded at the city of Mexico, on the 20th day of November, A. D. 1843; and in no case shall an award be made in favor of any claim not embraced by these principles and rules. And the United States do hereby for ever discharge the United Mexican States from all liability for any of the said claims, whether the same shall be rejected or allowed by the said board of commissioners.

FROM THE COUNTER-PROJECT PROPOSED BY
THE MEXICAN COMMISSIONERS.

4th. The dividing line between the two republics shall commence in the Gulf of Mexico, three leagues from land, opposite the southern mouth of the bay of Corpus Christi, running in a straight line from within the said bay to the mouth of the river Nueces; thence through the middle of that river in all its course to its source; from the source of the river Nueces shall be traced a straight line until it meets the present frontier of New Mexico on the east-south-east side, then follow the present boundary of New Mexico on the east, north and west, until this last touches the 37th degree; which will serve as a limit for both republics, from the point in which it touches the said frontier of west of New Mexico to the Pacific ocean. The government of Mexico promises not to found any new towns or establish colonies in the tract of land

which remains between the river Nueces and the Bravo del Norte.

5th. In just compensation for the extension of old limits which the United States may acquire by the previous article, the government of said United States is bound to pay over to the republic of Mexico the sum of _____, which shall be placed in the city of Mexico, at the disposal of the said government of the Mexican republic, in the act of exchanging the ratification of this treaty.

6th. The government of the United States is further bound to take upon itself and satisfy fully to the claimants all the instalments [cantidades] which are due up to this time, and may come due in future, by reason of the claims now liquidated, and decided against the Mexican republic, agreeably to the conventions arranged between the two republics, the 11th of April, 1839, and 30th of January, 1843, in such manner that the Mexican republic shall have absolutely no further payment to make by reason of the said reclamations.

7th. The government of the United States is also bound to take upon itself and pay fully all the claims of its own citizens, not yet decided, against the Mexican republic, whatever may be the title or motive from which they may proceed or in which they are founded; so that from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of the present treaty, there shall remain settled definitely and for ever, the accounts of every kind that exist, or may be supposed to exist, between the government of Mexico and the citizens of the United States.

8th. In order that the government of the United States may be able to satisfy, in observance of the previous article, the claims not yet decided of its citizens against the Mexican republic, there shall be established by the government of the said United States a tribunal of commissioners, whose decisions shall be conclusive and definitive; provided that, on deciding upon the validity of any demand, it may be adjusted by the principles and rules which were established in the articles 1st and 5th of the convention (not ratified) which was held in Mexico on the 20th of November, 1843, and in no case to give sentence in favor of any claim which is not adjusted in the prescribed rules.

Here, then, the state of the case may be seen at a glance. The President proposed through Mr. Trist, in substance, that the line of boundary between the two countries be so drawn that Mexico should cede to the United States, besides Texas, parts of the several States of Tamaulipas, Coahuila, and Chihuahua, the whole of New Mexico, and the two Californias, comprising, altogether, about 690,000 square miles of territory—rather more than twice the area within the present limits of the old thir-

teen States of this Union! This is in the fourth article; and then follows the proposed stipulations on our part, "in consideration of this extension of the boundaries of the United States." The first of these is, to pay a sum of money, in blank, to Mexico; and the next, to assume and pay the claims, liquidated and unliquidated, of our citizens on Mexico. Here we have the President's draught and proposition for a treaty.

And how does the Counter-Project of the Mexican Commissioners differ from this? It proposes that the line of boundary shall be so drawn, that Mexico shall cede to the United States, besides Texas, five degrees of latitude, or more than one half of the territory of Upper California, comprising about 190,000 square miles, or an area larger than that of eleven of the Atlantic States of this Union, taken together, beginning with Maine and running through to Virginia. This is in the fourth article; and then come the articles in which it is stipulated, "in just compensation for the extension of old limits," first, that the United States shall pay to Mexico a sum of money, in blank; and next, this government shall take upon itself to pay and satisfy the claims, liquidated and unliquidated, of our citizens on Mexico. Such is the Counter-Project. And what, we ask, now becomes of the official statement of the Message, that this project proposes to cede territory "for a pecuniary consideration"—as if there was something offensive in that—but contains "no provision for the payment by Mexico of the just claims of our citizens?" If there is no such provision in the plan proposed by Mexico, then there is none in the plan proposed by the President himself.

There was not only indemnity offered in the case, but indemnity of the most ample kind. We do not know that anybody would think of setting up the pretence, that the territory proposed to be ceded was not, at least, equal to the amount of these claims. There cannot be a doubt that it was worth a great deal more, and that equal justice would have required the payment of a considerable balance to Mexico, on account of the cession. It includes the harbor and bay of San Francisco, of itself worth a great deal more to the United States than the three, or four, or five

millions of Mexican indebtedness. The territory is about three times as large as the whole of New-England; and though, no doubt, a considerable portion of it, lying interior, between the coast chain and the Rocky Mountains, is of little value, yet we know that other parts of it have been found valuable enough to attract to it a considerable and increasing emigration from our own country. This is particularly the case with the country on the Sacramento, which is understood to be settled principally by emigrants from the United States. All these settlers would be brought within our own limits by this cession—thus putting an end at once to a serious difficulty which was brewing in that quarter before the war began, and which could hardly fail, sooner or later, to bring on another Annexation question to disturb the peace of the two countries. The Message sets forth in strong terms the advantages, commercial and other, which would accrue to the United States from the possession of Upper California. But all this has its best application to that northern portion, including the bay of San Francisco, which lies above the thirty-seventh parallel. It is this portion of the country that, "if held by the United States, would soon be settled by a hardy, enterprising, and intelligent portion of our population." It is the bay of San Francisco that "would afford shelter for our navy, for our numerous whale ships, and other merchant vessels employed in the Pacific Ocean, and would, in a short period, become the mart of an extensive and profitable commerce with China, and other countries of the East." One thing is certain—the President and his partisans are estopped by the Message from setting up any want of value in the cession which Mexico proposed to make, to constitute a full indemnity, and a good deal more than that, for the claims of our citizens on the justice of that country.

Here, then, we have the important fact that this object of the war, namely, the obtaining of indemnity for our unsatisfied claims on Mexico, was fully met and responded to by that government at the conference in September, between the Commissioners of the two republics. These claims have figured largely in all the war manifestos of the President. All that he

has had to say, and repeat, as he does in this last Message, about "the wanton violation of the rights of person and property of our citizens committed by Mexico; her repeated acts of bad faith through a long series of years, and her disregard of solemn treaties, stipulating for indemnity to our injured citizens;" all this, and much more of the same sort, wrought up, in the face of notorious facts, to the point of most absurd exaggeration and bluster, has had reference, of course, to these claims, for which, it stands confessed and recorded, whatever may have been her conduct in regard to them in times past, Mexico offered, in the conferences under the walls of her beleaguered capital, the most ample indemnity. From that moment these claims ceased to be matter which could be talked about, with decency, as cause of war with that power; from that moment, if war was to be prosecuted further against her, for any cause or any objects whatever, it was not certainly on account of these claims. And while the claims themselves could no longer be set up as a reason for continuing the war, it was equally impossible, with decency, to talk any longer, as the President does in this Message—perhaps from the mere habit of a sort of parrot repetition—about our magnanimous forbearance, of years' duration, in regard to these claims, manifested by our not having long and long ago asserted our rights by force; and how patiently we sought for redress by amicable negotiation; and how we were finally insulted in the person of "our minister of peace," by the mortifying rejection he endured. All this, we say, as incident to the subject matter of these claims, became obsolete, after the tender of full indemnity made by the Mexican Commissioners in September. And this war, as re-commenced and prosecuted after the breaking up of the conferences near Chapultepec, must find its justification, if any there be, in something else besides these claims, or any conduct of Mexico in relation to them.

But we observe that the President, in his Message, with that general disingenuousness and unvarying obliquity of purpose, which characterize nearly all the statements of the Message on the subject of the war, attempts to confound the understanding of his readers, by affecting to insist

upon the expenses of the war, as if he had ever made these expenses any part of his demands upon Mexico for indemnity. He does not make this assertion in terms; that would have been too gross and palpable for him to venture upon. And yet he means that the uninitiated reader shall so understand him. Referring to the project of a treaty, prepared at home, and which Mr. Trist took out with him, and to the fact that by the terms of that plan, "the indemnity required by the United States was a cession of territory," he proceeds to state why it was that this kind of indemnity—namely, territory—was insisted on. The reason is thus stated: "It is well known that the only indemnity which it is in the power of Mexico to make, in satisfaction of the just and long deferred claims of our citizens against her, *and the only means by which she can reimburse the United States for the expenses of the war*, is a cession to the United States of a portion of her territory."

Certainly no plain man, unacquainted with the particular facts, could read this paragraph without concluding that the demands of the President for indemnity, as embodied in the provisions of this project of a treaty, embraced the expenses of the war; that, instead of being a demand of indemnity for three or five millions at most, the demand was for indemnity to the amount of a hundred millions at least—for the full cost of the war, up to that time, was not one dollar within that sum. The advantage, no doubt, which the President proposed to himself by this statement, was the creation of a prevalent popular impression, that, however the actual issue might turn out, and whatever criminality, in the public estimation, had marked his conduct in precipitating the country into this war, he, for one, had endeavored to take care that it should cost the country nothing—except, indeed, some thousands of lives, which it would be difficult to make anybody pay for; that Mexico, besides being chastised into a compliance with whatever terms of peace we might see fit to prescribe to her, was to pay the money expenses of her own humiliation. And, besides this, it was convenient to the argument he was endeavoring to set up, to swell the supposed indemnity which was to be exacted of Mexico, from three or five

millions to a hundred millions; because it was only in this way that he could put a plausible face on his bold assumption of the inability of Mexico to meet our claims in any way but by a cession of territory.

And now, after all this, what will be thought of the President of the United States, when the fact comes to be stated and proved, that by the terms of his own project of a treaty, not only was no claim set up for the expenses of the war, but any pretence of that sort was necessarily negated and excluded? Nobody will be silly enough to pretend that under the stipulations of a treaty of peace, which makes not the slightest reference to the expenses of the war on either side, either party is to pay more than its own expenses. In the President's plan of a treaty, Mexico is not asked, nor is the remotest hint conveyed that she is expected, to pay us the costs of the war. Besides, any such idea is excluded by the stipulations actually inserted in the instrument. Mexico was indebted to our citizens in a certain amount—say four millions of dollars—and this plan proposes that if Mexico will cede to the United States certain lands, the government of the United States will undertake to satisfy the creditors of Mexico in this country for this indebtedness, in such manner that she shall be fully discharged from it. And, as it is understood that the lands proposed to be ceded are worth more than this four millions of dollars, it is proposed that the United States shall pay to Mexico the balance of this value, whatever it may be ascertained or agreed to be. Such was the President's own proposition for a settlement and treaty of peace with Mexico; and he does not get through the tortuous course of his Message without giving this very account and explanation of the matter.

"As the territory," he says, "to be acquired by the boundary proposed, might be estimated to be of greater value than a fair equivalent for our just demands, our Commissioner was authorized to stipulate for the payment of such additional pecuniary consideration as was deemed reasonable."

Not a word here about the expenses of the war. No intimation here that the balance of value to be paid in money to Mexico was only so much as would remain af-

ter deducting four millions for the demands due our citizens, and a hundred millions more for the cost of the war. The President knows as well as we do, that the expenses of this war, end when and how it may, are to be borne by the people of the United States; and he did not entertain the remotest idea, when this project of a treaty was prepared, that Mexico was to be made to pay, or asked to pay these expenses, or any part of them. He knew then, and he knows now, that Mexico will never make a treaty with the United States on any such basis.

In our account of what the President proposed as the basis of a treaty with Mexico, we have had reference to what the Washington Union some time since published as "the authentic copy of the draught of a treaty carried out by Mr. Trist."* It would seem that Mr. Trist went a step further, in the project presented by him to the Mexican Commissioners. He inserted, in the fifth article, a reference to the stipulation contained in article eight, in regard to a right of way across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, as forming a part of the general consideration for the undertakings proposed on the part of the United States; and then, by way of addition to the stipulations for paying the claims of our own citizens, and the payment of a clear sum of money to Mexico, he inserted this express renunciation: "*The United States abandon forever all claims against the United Mexican States, on account of the expenses of the war.*" After all this, it is difficult to understand how the President could have the courage to talk about the expenses of the war in the manner he has done in the Message. At any rate, we trust an enlightened public will understand the true state of the case.

Thus far, then, we have seen that two principal subjects or matters of difference between the United States and Mexico at the commencement of the war, were actually removed, so far as the most ample concessions on the part of Mexico could remove them, at the conferences near Chapultepec in September last. Mexico yielded her pretensions to the State of Texas, and all complaints she had to make on ac-

* We have not had in hand the official papers as sent in to Congress with the Message.

count of Annexation. This struck at the original source of all the difficulty between the two powers, and made an end of it, so far as Mexico could alone effect that object. Mexico also offered ample indemnity for the claims of our citizens, in the mode preferred and insisted on by us—that is to say, by a cession of territory; and thus put an end, so far as she alone could do it, to all complaints which we had to prefer against her for neglect of those claims, and whatever other conduct in relation to them we had thought exceptionable. There remained, therefore, only one original subject of dispute between the two powers, and that was the undefined boundary between our State of Texas and the dominions of Mexico. It must be admitted that the President went into the war claiming the right to the whole country between the Nueces and the Rio del Norte; though it is perfectly certain that this was not such a claim on our part, that any Congress of the United States, which alone has the power of declaring war, would ever have undertaken to enforce it by the sword. Mexico refused to cede to us this territory, at the conferences near Chapultepec, and this question of boundary remained, therefore, *in statu quo*, when the war was resumed.

The important inquiry now arises, whether the war thus resumed had for part of its object, the enforcement of the President's demand, clearly embraced in his project of a treaty, for the cession of the whole country between the Nueces and the Rio del Norte? We suppose there cannot be a doubt of it. The fact is sufficiently indicated in this brief and characteristic announcement in the Message: "The boundary of the Rio Grande, and the cession to the United States of New Mexico and Upper California, constituted an *ultimatum*, which our Commissioner was, under no circumstances, to yield." The history of the conferences shows that the Commissioner, though with evident misgivings, acted up to the letter of his instructions on this point. He would not yield "the boundary to the Rio Grande," but "he offered that if there remained no other point of difference for the conclusion of peace, than that relative to the territory which is comprised between the Bravo and the Nueces, he would consult his govern-

ment upon it, with some hope of a good result." Such is the Mexican official account. Mr. Trist, it is evident, did not believe it possible the President would dare to make the renewal and continuance of the war turn on his adherence to the absurd and baseless pretension he had set up, of a right and title in the United States to a "boundary to the Rio Grande." Mr. Trist had manifestly been impressed with the pregnant and severe tone of the following declaration, in the note addressed to him by the Mexican Commissioners:—

"To the other territories, [i. e. besides the proper territory of Texas,] mentioned in the fourth article of your Excellency's draught, [including, of course, the country between the Nueces and the Bravo,] no right has heretofore been asserted by the Republic of North America, nor do we believe it possible for it to assert any. Consequently, it could not acquire them, except by the right of conquest, or by the title which will result from the cession or sale which Mexico might now make. But as we are persuaded that the Republic of Washington will not only absolutely repel, but will hold in abhorrence, the first of these titles, and as, on the other hand, it would be a new thing, and contrary to every idea of justice, to make war on a people, for no other reason than because it refused to sell territory which its neighbor sought to buy, we hope, from the justice of the government and people of North America, that the ample modifications which we have to propose, to the cessions of territory (except that of the State of Texas) contemplated by the said Article Four, will not be a motive to persist in a war which the worthy General of the North American troops has justly styled unnatural."

But, however the Commissioner of the United States might have been impressed and moved by an appeal so replete with the force of simple truth and natural justice, he was bound by an Executive *ultimatum*, which embraced other points, that Mexico could no more yield than she could this demand of a boundary to the Rio Grande. The President *must* have New Mexico and Upper California, as well as the whole territory between the Nueces and the Bravo. Mexico could not yield to any of these demands, to the extent to which the President's ultimatum carried them; and nothing remained, therefore, but to renew and prosecute the war. She did offer, be it observed, to give up the most valuable portion of Upper California; and

she offered, also, so far to relinquish her possessory right, or right of occupation, to the wide uninhabited frontier of the country between the two rivers, as to stipulate that it should be preserved as an uninhabited and desert space forever, expressly for a safe and peaceable frontier between the two countries. And this enables us to see exactly upon what precise pretensions and demands of the President it was, in regard to territory, that the war was renewed, after the concessions made at the conferences near Chapultepec; and we desire to set down these pretensions and demands very precisely, and to call the attention of the country to them in a very particular manner, that the people may clearly understand what it really was, the war was resumed for. The war, then, was resumed and prosecuted, after the conferences near Chapultepec, for the following objects:

First, to compel Mexico, who was willing and ready to relinquish her right of occupation in the wide uninhabited space between the Nueces and the Rio Grande, so as to make that desert space in effect the boundary between the two countries, to go further and cede to us in absolute sovereignty and jurisdiction, the whole of that territory up to the Rio Grande;

Second, to compel Mexico, who was willing to yield us one half, and the most valuable portion of Upper California, to go further, and sell to us the other half also;

And, third, to compel Mexico to sell to us her province of New Mexico.

Of these three objects, the first is the only one, it will be observed, which, in any shape whatever, found a place among those original subjects of demand, to which alone the war from its inception, apparently or professedly, had any relation. The other two objects became objects of the war for the first time, so far as any distinct avowal or disclosure is concerned, when it was renewed after the conferences near Chapultepec. But the truth is that the whole three objects just specified, stand in fact, when properly understood, on the same footing. The demand which the President makes of a boundary on the Rio Grande, is just as much in the spirit of conquest as the rest. These last, as we now see, stand out open and undisguised. To compel our unwilling enemy, by force

of arms, to sell her territory to us, is to exercise over her and her territory the rights of conquest. Payment in such a case is no equivalent. It is not a bargain, though we pay our money for the lands, where the cession is compulsory. If effected, it is nothing less than a robbery, with the insult added of throwing our purse in the face of our victim, by way of charity, or for the sake of appearances. The object is to dismember the Mexican empire, and appropriate her territories to our own use, by virtue of our military superiority. The President wants these territories because he thinks it will gratify a spirit of rapacity which he imagines dwells in the hearts of our people, and will glorify his administration before the masses, who, he believes, will make no account whatever of the money price of the robbery. He believes they would like it still better if he had resolved to keep the territory already conquered, and the money too. And we do not entertain a doubt that he would have preferred this policy from the first, if he had thought it as practicable as the other; he would have let appearances take care of themselves.

The truth is, that the offer of money to Mexico for her conquered provinces, was not to pay for the land, but *to buy a peace of her after the conquest*. He thought this would be better than perpetual war, and the support of large standing armies, to maintain the conquests. It was not justice, but policy, that dictated the offer. It was better, he thought, to pay Mexico twenty millions for her craven consent to her own dismemberment and degradation, than undertake to maintain his conquests by arms, at the cost of another hundred millions. Brennus, the Gallic conqueror, finding his affairs in desperate condition, but *game* to the last, demanded to receive of Rome a thousand pounds of gold for retiring from his conquests, for thus he would go home an acknowledged conqueror, though giving up the provinces he had overrun. Our modern American Brennus understands the glory of conquest differently; he is willing to pay Mexico a thousand pounds of gold to stop her resistance, allow him to keep the provinces he has overrun, and so come home a conqueror. Brennus proudly threw his sword into the scale at the last moment, as his ultimate argument

with the Roman: Mr. Polk, too, gallantly threw in his sword, but at last he offers to withdraw it, and weigh down the scales with money, as his ultimate argument with the Mexican. But Mexico, though in the extremity of distress, refuses to take money as the price of her honor—she refuses to allow the President to salve her sore humiliation in that mode. And this puts him in a dilemma: he must retire from this chosen field of his glory without the ill-gotten fruits of his successful military exploits, or he must prosecute his war from this time forward, for the naked purpose of subjugation and dismemberment. The latter alternative, as we shall see, is the one he has chosen, and recommends in his Message to Congress and the country.

Recurring to the particulars embraced in the policy of conquest and dismemberment, now disclosed and avowed by the President, and confining our attention still for a while to the state of things as they existed at the breaking up of the conferences near Chapultepec, let us observe how naked and undisguised the object is, in each particular. We have shown the offer made of half the vast province of Upper California, not only giving the United States the most ample indemnity for all the claims of our citizens on Mexico, but very far exceeding in value to us the amount of those claims. We have shown, also, that beyond these claims, the President, in his negotiations with Mexico, did not set up any other or further demands for indemnity. After deducting the amount of these claims, he offered to pay Mexico as much money as the territories he wanted were deemed worth. It is merely absurd, or it is much worse than that, for him now to talk about the expenses of the war, as if he expected to make Mexico pay them. He has known from the beginning, that we could make no claim on her for the cost of the war, and that this was an account which the people of his own country must pay, without recourse or redress anywhere. And on these terms he offered to make peace with Mexico—provided only she would cede to us as much territory as he desired to get, for an equivalent in money.

When the war was resumed, then, under the walls of the Mexican capital, we aver and maintain, that it was for the sole

purpose of compelling Mexico to consent, for a consideration in money, to the dismemberment of her empire, by ceding to the United States three distinct parcels of her territory, to neither of which had we the slightest claim of right, either on the ground of indemnity, or on the ground of title. The pretence of further indemnity, rather hinted at or disingenuously insinuated, than actually set up, in the Message, we have already disposed of. We must say a few words on the matter of title.

No boldness nor ingenuity has ever enabled the President to assert any right or title to the Californias. The demand, therefore, as an ultimatum, of the remaining half of Upper California, after Mexico had offered to yield up the first half by way of indemnity and for the sake of peace, was a naked demand of dismemberment to that extent, though for a consideration in money, to be agreed to by Mexico, under the penalty of an immediate resumption and prosecution of the war against her.*

The demand made for the cession of New Mexico, was of the same character and rested on the same foundation. It is true, the President has the amazing coolness to venture on a suggestion in his Message, that there was a question of boundary to be adjusted between the province of New Mexico and the State of Texas, on the ground that "the territorial limits of the State of Texas, as defined by her laws before her admission into our Union, embrace all that portion of New Mexico lying east of the Rio Grande." Everybody knows that Texas might as well have extended her limits, by a statutory declaration—a ridiculous, *brutum fulmen*—over the whole of Old Mexico, as over a part of the province of New Mexico; and such an act would have given her just as much right and title in that case, as it did in the other. But besides this, it is perfectly notorious that the President, utterly disregarding any claim of the State of Texas upon New Mexico, on account of this statutory declaration, seeing she had never occupied a foot of the soil of that territory, ordered the country to be conquered for the United States, which was done accord-

* The Mexican Commissioners say that Mr. Trist was disposed to abandon his first pretensions "to a part of Upper California." If so, it was in the face of the President's ultimatum.

ingly after a fashion, when he caused a civil government to be set up there under his authority. The demand, therefore, as an ultimatum, of the whole of New Mexico, on both sides of the Rio Grande, was a naked demand for the further dismemberment of Mexico, though for a consideration in money, to be assented to by that power, under the penalty of an immediate resumption and prosecution of the war against her.

Let, now, any man, possessing any just sensibility to the honor and proper fame of the country, turn to the President's Message, and read there, without a blush of shame if he can, the reasons which that high officer has grouped together to justify the nefarious demand which he caused to be made upon Mexico for the dismemberment of that country, by the forced cession of Upper California and New Mexico to the United States. We will give the substance and real meaning of these reasons, leaving it to the reader to verify our brief exposition by recurring to the President's own language.

The President believes, then, that as Mexico *must* be dismembered, it is for her convenience and interest, as well as our own, that these two provinces should be lopped off rather than any other. They lie a great way off from her capital, and if she does not lose them now, it is manifest the time will come when she will have to give them up. This is especially true of Upper California, and if we don't take it now, some other foreign power may, by-and-by. Or it may become independent of Mexico, by a revolutionary movement, and then be annexed to some other country; and if annexed to any country but our own, we should have to fight that country for it. These territories are contiguous to our territories, and if we had them we would bring them on, and make something out of them. Upper California is bounded right upon our Oregon possessions, and we could stock it with a good population, and, with the use of its harbors, make great commercial profits out of it, in which the commercial world might participate. New Mexico is naturally connected with our Western settlements, and after all is not worth much to Mexico. Besides, our State of Texas once threw its paper arms around the neck of this darling province, and *embraced* it with affection.

And, then, see what a benefit it would be to Mexico to give this province up to us; for we could protect it, and her, against the Indians, and make them give up their captives! Finally, in ceding these provinces to us, there would only be a moderate population of Mexican citizens [probably only about 175,000] who would be transferred, like cattle, without their consent and against their will, from Mexico to the United States. "These," adds the President, "were the *leading considerations* which induced me to authorize the terms of peace which were proposed to Mexico. They were rejected; and negotiations being at an end, hostilities were renewed." These were the "*leading considerations*" which induced the President to instruct his Commissioner, that unless Mexico, besides giving up to us half of the vast province of Upper California for our full indemnity, which she offered to do, would consent to a further dismemberment by ceding to us the rest of that province, and the whole of New Mexico, for a sum of money, the war should go on. Even if the Rio Grande had been yielded as a boundary for Texas, and every other demand of the President, still, for the "*leading considerations*" we have recited, the war was to go on unless Mexico would give up also the whole of New Mexico and Upper California!

But besides these two provinces, there was that other considerable tract of country, embracing parts of three Mexican States, and having altogether an area of about 45,000 square miles—nearly equal to New-York—lying between the Nueces and the Bravo, which was also demanded as an ultimatum. And to this, as to the rest, except where there was an inconsiderable settlement on and near the Nueces, the United States had not the slightest claim of right, for herself or for Texas, unless by conquest. Yet this is the country in reference to which the President repeats in the present Message, the stale and miserable fiction, so often exposed before, that Mexico "*involved the two countries in war by invading the territory of the State of Texas, striking the first blow, and shedding the blood of our citizens on our own soil;*" that "*Mexico commenced the war, and we were compelled, in self-defence, to repel the invader!*" In the name of Truth, and by the authority of its unerring

Records, we pronounce every word of all this statement utterly without foundation in fact. The country where our army was found when the first blood was shed, was not American soil. It was in the peaceable possession and actual occupancy of Mexico, and under her undisputed jurisdiction, as it had always been since she was a nation, and as Spain had possessed and governed it before her. If the United States once preferred a claim, as against Spain, to the Rio del Norte as the boundary of French Louisiana, the pretension was yielded by solemn treaty with that power in 1819. Thus the Sabine was settled as the boundary of our possessions in that direction, and the Republic of Mexico became the undisputed mistress of the country from that river westward. Texas with Coahuila was a State of the Mexican Confederation, and the indisputable limit of Texas in the south-west was the Nueces. Texas revolted and established her independence; and when she annexed herself to the United States, the Nueces was still her boundary, except that she had so far encroached on the neighboring loyal State of Tamaulipas, as to have a small settlement on the right bank of that river, over which she exercised jurisdiction. Thus far the just claim of Texas may go, and no farther. Beyond Corpus Christi, or San Patricio, in that direction, she had neither possession nor jurisdiction. Thence began a desert, a hundred and twenty miles wide, and reaching to within a few miles of the Rio Grande, where was a long established Mexican population, under undisputed Mexican jurisdiction. Here it was the first blood was shed in this war. The claim which Texas asserted to the whole of this country between the rivers Nueces and del Norte, and that which the President has set up after her example, rest on a title which is no better than a base and impudent forgery. *It is a naked paper title in the shape of legislative enactments, made by the party setting up the claim, and having not a shadow of right to stand upon.* A man could as well make himself a deed of his neighbor's farm, and establish a right under it in a court of justice. The most distinguished men of the President's own party have derided and denounced this claim of title: Benton, Wright, Woodbury, have done so. The President himself has

repudiated the main ground of the claim set up by Texas—her Legislative Act of 1836, declaring the Rio Grande to be her boundary in its whole extent; for this would give her a large part of New Mexico, and he has, by the most unequivocal acts, treated this part of her claim with contempt.

Though it be true, therefore, that *the President* asserted a claim for a boundary on the Rio Grande, when this war was begun, yet it was only a claim, and had not a shadow of truth and justice to support it. The boundary between the State of Texas and the Republic of Mexico was undefined, and so considered and left by Congress in the Act of Annexation. It was no further undefined and in dispute, however, than as Texas had laid the foundation of a claim to some territory on and adjacent to the right bank of the Nueces, by having established and exercised actual jurisdiction over some small settlements along there. But because this left the President at liberty to plant one foot on the Nueces, it did not authorize him to plant the other on the Bravo, and so claim the whole country embraced in his colossal stride. Considering the hold which Texas has acquired on the Mexican side of the Nueces, and looking at the peculiar topography of the country, the true boundary separating the two countries, would be the broad desert between the two rivers, the line of which might properly run through its centre. We have not a doubt that Mexico would have consented to this, if it had been proposed or suggested. In effect, indeed, this is what she herself proposed. She offered to have the uninhabited desert preserved forever as a boundary, and barrier, to secure each country from the other.

She knew very well that peace could never be maintained, if the Anglo-Saxon was to be planted on one side of a narrow stream like the Rio del Norte, from which he could look into the windows of the Mexican on the opposite side; and she refused to make that river the boundary. Besides, though the real value of the country was not great, yet there were Mexican citizens who had their home on the left bank of that river, and she nobly declared that "it was not for the Mexican government to weigh the price of the attachment of the citizen to the soil on which

he is born." "As to these Mexicans, can a government go and sell them like cattle!"

We do not hesitate to say that the claim of title, or right, asserted by the President to the entire tract between the Nueces and the Bravo, was a baseless pretension, set up to cover a foregone resolution, right or wrong, to make it a part of the territory of the United States. And the demand, therefore, at the conferences near Chapultepec, of "a boundary on the Rio Grande," as an ultimatum, notwithstanding the offer of Mexico to make the desert, intermediate the two rivers, in effect, the frontier of the two countries, was, in truth, like those for California and New Mexico, a naked demand for the further dismemberment still of Mexico, to be assented to by that power, under the penalty of the immediate resumption and prosecution of the war against her.

We have said, that from the termination of the conferences between Mr. Trist and the Mexican Commissioners, the war became explicitly and without disguise a war for the Conquest and Dismemberment of Mexico. We say that Conquest and Dismemberment became the *SOLE* object of the war. We have shown precisely what particular portions of the Mexican dominions were demanded to be ceded to the United States, and that, in every instance, these were naked demands, without any just pretence of right or title, and without any excuse or apology, to be found in any remaining cause of complaint against Mexico, or any unsatisfied claims upon her for indemnity, existing when the war commenced, or to which the war could have any just relation. We have shown how every other demand of the American Commissioner, except only his naked demands for the dismemberment of the Mexican empire, was met by the most ample offers and concessions on the part of the Mexican Commissioners, leaving, in very truth, nothing else but those demands for dismemberment for the war to stand on.

It is only necessary to add here, that there were just two things embraced in the Counter-Project of a treaty presented by the Mexican Commissioners, which would have been deemed inadmissible by Mr. Trist, and which, there cannot be a doubt, would have been adjusted without

difficulty, if Mr. Trist's demands for territory had not put an end to all hopes of peace. Mexico asked for indemnity to her citizens for injuries sustained from our troops in the prosecution of the war; and she wished to levy duties on goods found in her ports, which had been imported under the authority of the President, and had paid duties into *his* military chest. The President makes the most of these objectionable claims, in his Message, calling them a part of the Mexican ultimatum, and forgetting entirely that the Mexican Commissioners, in presenting their Counter-Project, referred to them expressly as matters of "minor moment," which could occasion no serious difficulty. It is certain that the negotiations for peace did not fail on account of these matters of "minor moment," but that they did fail solely on the ground of the naked demands of our Commissioner, as the President's ultimatum, for the dismemberment of the Mexican empire.

Let it be observed, then—let the people of this abused country understand—that it was upon such an issue as we have here demonstrated—upon the President's demands and ultimatum, for the dismemberment of Mexico, and upon that issue only—that this war was begun *de novo*, after the breaking up of the conferences near Chapultepec. Upon this Issue of Dismemberment, the awful battle of El Molino del Rey was fought. Upon this Issue of Dismemberment, the terrible conflict at Chapultepec was waged, and the murderous affairs at the gates of Belen and San Cosme were enacted. Upon this Issue of Dismemberment, the proud capital of the enemy was entered, sword in hand, and the colors of the United States hoisted on the National Palace. Wonderful achievements all—brilliant and glorious feats of arms—if only they had been exhibited in a cause where national justice and honor, and human rights and human liberty, were to be defended! But every blow was struck—every life sacrificed—every gaping and hideous wound inflicted—upon this naked Issue of Dismemberment! Upwards of sixteen hundred gallant American citizens and noble spirits—and among them some of the most valued in the land—were struck down in these battles alone; and of the enemy, whole hecatombs were sacrificed;

all, all, upon this naked Issue of Dismemberment! Mexico would not consent to dismemberment, for a consideration in money, and so the war was begun *de novo*, and prosecuted at the cost of such a horrible amount of human sacrifice.

We are already beyond the limits of the proper space allotted for this article, and we must hasten to a conclusion, before we have half finished what we would have said about the President's Message and the War. The Message shows us plainly enough what perplexity the President has suffered, since he has found, what all considerate and wise men understood before, that Mexico is no nearer submitting to his demand for her dismemberment, now that her capital has fallen, than she was before. Let the country ponder well what he has finally brought his courage up to propose as the future policy to be pursued. Instead of moderating his demands, he actually proposes to enlarge them. He now demands Lower California with the rest. He now calls upon Congress to aid him, by legislative acts and ample military supplies, in appropriating permanently to ourselves, and without any reference to Mexican consent, both the Californias, the whole of New Mexico, and the tract between the Nueces and Bravo. Of course, they can only be appropriated as countries conquered in war. And we are not to content ourselves with taking, and governing, and defending these countries, but we must still prosecute the war, "with increased energy and power in the *vital parts of the enemy's country*." We must hold her other towns and provinces, so far as already overpowered, and as many more as we can yet conquer, by military occupation, and we must try to feed our armies on the substance of the Mexican people. And all this we must do, in order to compel Mexico to cease her resistance to us, and consent

and submit—as a lamb submits to the slaughter—to the enforced and enlarged dismemberment of her empire, which we are resolved to complete and execute. All that is asked of her is, that she shall allow us, without gainsaying or resistance, to appropriate to ourselves, including Texas, only a little more than half of her territorial empire; we generously consenting that, for the present, she shall keep what is left. She has offered us enough for ample indemnity; but she must give us the rest, according to our demands, or suffer the horrors of an eternal war in the *vital parts* of her country!

What will Congress do on this great theme and subject? Near the close of the last session the Whigs in both Houses—in the Senate, on the motion of Mr. BERRIEN, from the South; in the House, on the motion of Mr. WINTHROP, from the North—voted in solid column, with only one nominal exception in each House, for restricting the Executive in the conduct of the war, so that it should not be prosecuted for the dismemberment of Mexico. The Whigs in the present Congress will not forget this example. Can there be a sane man in Congress, or in the country, who has the true honor and the safety of the country at heart, and is governed by any notions of common justice, who will not say, with Texas yielded and the vexed question of Annexation at rest; with the broad desert between the Nueces and the Bravo for a boundary and frontier separating Texas from Mexico; and with five degrees, or 190,000 square miles, of the territory of Upper California for our indemnity, including the finest harbor and bay in that part of the Pacific; that we ought to have peace with Mexico? God help this infatuated country, if peace may not be embraced and secured on the offer of such terms as these! D. D. B.

MR. CALHOUN'S REPORT

ON THE MEMPHIS MEMORIAL.

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, JUNE 26, 1846.

THE proceedings of the Convention at Chicago in July last, and the hope founded upon them of an early and favorable action of Congress on the subject of river and harbor improvements, give a new interest to what has heretofore been said and written, touching the extent of the power of Congress in making the desired appropriations. In this connection, several of the doctrines advanced by Mr. Calhoun, in his Report to the Senate on the Memorial of the Memphis Convention, hold a conspicuous place; and, from the character of their author, as well as the novelty and importance of the principles presented, are worthy of a special examination. Such an examination we propose to give, prefacing what we may offer with a brief abstract of so much of the Report as comes within my purpose.

Convinced of the importance of the navigation of the Mississippi and its great tributaries, and of the indispensable necessity of removing the obstructions to them, Mr. Calhoun raises the inquiry, by whom these obstructions shall be removed. "Who," he asks, "has the power, and whose duty is it, to improve the navigation of the Mississippi and its great tributaries?" He answers: "It is certainly not that of individuals. Its improvement is beyond their means and power. Nor is it that of the several States bordering on its navigable waters: it is also beyond their means and power, acting separately. Nor can it be done by their joint action. There are sixteen States, and two Territories that soon will be States, lying either wholly or partly within the valley of the Mississippi, and there is still ample space for several more. These all have a common interest in its commerce. Their united and joint action would be requisite for the improvement of its navigation. But the only means by

which that could be obtained is expressly prohibited by the 10th section of the 1st article of the Constitution, which provides that 'No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation.' But if neither individuals nor States, acting separately or jointly, have the power to improve its navigation, it must belong to the Federal Government, if the power exists at all, as there is no other agency or authority, in our system of government, by which it could be exercised. But if it does, it must be comprised among the expressly granted or enumerated powers, or among those necessary and proper to carry them into effect; as under the one or the other all the powers belonging to it are to be found; and thus the question is presented for consideration—is it to be found in either?"

Whether the needful power be found in either the express or implied powers, the Report proceeds to consider; and after denying that it is to be found in the clause giving to Congress the power "to levy and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States," or that it is to be found in the category of necessarily implied powers, it expresses the opinion, "after full and mature consideration of the subject," that it is to be found in the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States," and more specifically, in that to regulate it among the States. After expressing this opinion of the *existence* and *origin* of the power, the Report goes on to explain what the Committee "believe to be the nature and extent of the power;" and, on this point, the Committee are of opinion that the words "among the States" restrict the power to the regulation of the commerce of the States with each other, as separate or dis-

tinct communities, to the exclusion of its regulation within their respective limits, except as far as may be indispensable to its due exercise. Their effect, in other words, is, to restrict the power delegated to Congress to regulate commerce among the States, to their external commerce with each other as States; and to leave their internal commerce, with the exception above stated, under the exclusive control of the several States respectively.

In reference to the *extent* of the power conferred on Congress by a fair interpretation of the terms "regulate commerce," within the restriction above indicated, as imposed by the terms "among the States," the Committee are of opinion, "that they confer upon it all the powers which belonged to them (the terms) as fully as the States themselves possessed it, except such, if there be any, as may be prohibited by the Constitution from being exercised, either expressly or impliedly." On this assumption, and on further inquiry, "what powers the States were accustomed to exercise in regulating their commerce, before and at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, as far as they relate to its safety and facility," the Committee find that "the powers they exercised for that purpose were restricted to the establishment of light-houses, buoys, beacons, and public piers;" and that these powers were exercised by the several States, up to the period referred to, along the Atlantic coast. The Committee hence conclude, that the same powers legitimately belong to Congress, as conferred by the terms "regulate commerce;" and that "Congress, from the beginning of the government until the present time," have exercised them accordingly.

Having fixed the subjects upon which Congress might legitimately exercise the power "to regulate commerce," *along the Atlantic coast*, the Committee proceed to inquire whether the *Mississippi* might be brought within the power, so that "snags and other obstructions which endanger and impede its navigation," might be constitutionally removed; and after elaborate argument, they express themselves of the opinion that that river is within the principle of the power, and that it "extends to the removal of all obstructions within its channel, the removal of which would add

to the safety and facility of its navigation." They are also of opinion that it "extends to the removal of like obstructions in its navigable tributaries, including such as have *three or more* States bordering on their navigable waters, but *not* to those whose navigable waters are embraced within *one*, or, farthest, *two* States."

In further prosecution of their inquiries, as to the objects of the power "to regulate commerce," the Committee proceed "to consider whether harbors, or canals around falls or other obstructions of the Mississippi, including its great tributaries (thereby meaning those bordered by three or more States,) are embraced in the power;" and they come to the conclusion, "that harbors, *except for shelter*, are not" within the power; and that the cutting of canals or the construction of roads around falls, &c., are also excluded from it.

From the abstract of the Report thus given, it appears, that the Committee concede the power to Congress, of river and harbor improvements in its general principle, but encumber it with such modifications in the application of it, as to deprive it largely of its value. It may well be regretted, that a mind so ingenious, and, in general, so sound, in vindicating a principle of such transcendent moment as the author of the Report admits the one in question to be, should not have been able so to present it in its applications, as to make it as broad in its operation to do good, as it is obviously capable, in itself, of doing it.

We propose to discuss and to controvert the three following propositions presented in the abstract:—

1. That the constitutional power of Congress "to regulate commerce among the States," by the removal of obstructions from navigable waters, does *not* extend to those waters which run within only one State.

2. That it does not extend to those confined to two States, whether dividing or flowing through them.

3. That it does not extend to the construction of harbors *for commerce*, but only those for *shelter*.

A fourth proposition, viz., that the power does not extend to the cutting of canals, or the construction of roads around falls, shoals, or other obstructions or impedi-

ments to navigation, &c., has, in its principle, for years, been so much, and in such various forms, before the public, that I should deem its discussion superfluous here, and shall therefore omit it.

As to the first proposition, that the power does not extend to rivers running in only one State: It will be remembered that the Committee has said, in reply to their own question, "Who has the power, and whose duty is it, to improve the navigation of the Mississippi and its great tributaries?" that "it is certainly not that of individuals, because beyond the reach of their means and power;" nor yet that of the several States bordering on its navigable waters, acting separately, for the same reason; "nor can it be done by their joint action," because they are prohibited by the Constitution from forming any alliance, &c. The Committee then go on to say, that, as the power and duty belong to neither of these, if they belong anywhere, it must be to the Federal Government; and, after much discussion, they find them there, with certain modifications, under the power "to regulate commerce." Now, it is difficult to perceive why this reasoning of the Committee is not, or may not be, just as applicable to the cases of rivers running in *one* State or *two* States, as to those of rivers bordered by *three* States. Rivers under the former class of cases, it is conceded, are just as much open to the commerce of all the States, as those of the latter are, and all the States may be equally interested in the improvement of their navigation; and it is evident that the point of inability to improve the navigation for the want of means, is or may be quite as true (if not more so) of the one class of cases as of the other. It is equally evident, that the failure to improve for want of such means on the part of a single State, in a given case, might not be more inconvenient to such State itself, than to the States generally, whose commerce with such single State, through a river running only within its own limits, requiring improvements to make its navigation practicable, might be of the greatest moment to the general good. Hence, it should seem that, to make such a case an exception to the general power of Congress to make appropriations for river improvements, the argument establishing it should be so certain as

not to admit of reasonable doubt. If there be such doubt, the clearest public good would seem to require, that the benefit of it should be given in favor of the power and against the exception. Do the Committee make out such a case beyond such doubt? Do they, indeed, give colorable support to their proposition? Let us examine.

Two reasons are offered in support of the proposition:—

First. That the power "is restricted to the external commerce of the States, with each other, to the exclusion of their internal;" and,

Second. That the commerce of such rivers is under the exclusive control of the States within whose limits their navigable waters are confined, with two exceptions, viz.: first, "that no vessel from another State, coming or going, can be compelled to enter, clear or pay duties;" and, second, "that vessels from other States shall not be subject to any regulation or law in navigating them, to which the vessels of the State to which they belong are not."

As to the first of these two reasons, I shall consider it as equivalent to another proposition in a previous part of the Report, viz.: that the words "among the States," restrict the power "to regulate commerce" to "its regulation with each other, as separate and distinct communities, to the exclusion of its regulation within their respective limits, except as far as may be indispensable to its due exercise;" and that, "with this exception, the internal commerce of the States is under the exclusive control of the several States, respectively." Now, upon this proposition I have two remarks to make:—

First. That it would be difficult to find a subject for the exercise of the power "to regulate commerce among the several States," which should not, of necessity, exist within the limits of a single State. It must have a locality somewhere—at least, in its inception—and this cannot be in more States than one. If this be so, the negation, in the proposition, of the power, as to its exercise within the limits of a single State, would seem to be meaningless; and the *exception* may be regarded as, in fact, an affirmation of the power,—without the limit which the idea of its being an exception would imply.

My *second*, and, perhaps, more impor-

tant remark upon this proposition, would be, that as it stands in the Report, it involves a confusion of ideas; which appears thus: The power given to Congress is, "to regulate commerce *among* the States." Of course, these terms exclude the power to regulate the commerce of a single State within its own limits; and yet we are told that this latter power exists, "as far as it may be indispensable to the due exercise of the former!" This must be the meaning of the Report; for, in the point in hand, no distinction is made between internal and external commerce, as respects operations within a single State. Now, we deny that the power exists in Congress, *at all*, or *for any purpose*, to regulate the commerce of a single State, within its own limits, *as such*; and the confusion of ideas involved in the proposition of the Report, consists in this: that it makes an act of Congress, executed, within the limits of a single State, with a view to the external commerce of such State with other States, to be an act so far regulating the internal commerce of such State itself. Now, such an act can, in no conceivable bearing, be so construed or regarded; for, the commercial operation to which it applies must take its *character* as an operation of internal or external commerce, from its *purpose*; and this, by the supposition, looks exclusively to a commerce beyond the State in which it is performed.

Our proposition, on this subject, would be this: that whatever legislation, to be carried out, for the regulation of commerce *within* the limits of a single State, is connected with, or bears upon, the promotion of commerce *outside* those limits, must be considered as embraced within the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States." Hence, any appropriation made by Congress for the improvement of a river running in only one State, the object of which would be, to promote the commerce of that State with other States, or with foreign nations, would manifestly be within the Constitution. This the Report denies, in its general proposition, that the power of Congress to improve rivers, does not extend to rivers running in only one State. But this denial, in our judgment, cannot be sustained. For one thing is quite clear, that every instance of commercial opera-

tion, foreign or domestic, must have its origin, as has already been intimated, in some single spot or State; and, if it is intended by the operator to go beyond the State, it is equally clear that he is entitled to the benefit of national legislation, "to regulate" his case, as making a part of the commerce with foreign nations or among the several States, for which the Constitution has provided. There will, of course, be instances innumerable, of commercial operations intended to terminate within the State in which they have originated. These are admitted, nay, claimed, to be exclusively subjects of State legislation. But a rule is necessary to discriminate between the two classes of cases, that we may know when to apply the power and when not; and, for this purpose, we can perceive or imagine no other rule, than that afforded by the intentions of the parties as carried out and proved, either by a transmission of operations beyond the limits of the State, on the one hand, or a retention and consummation of them within these limits, on the other. In the one case, it is commerce with foreign nations or among the several States; in the other, it is not. In the one case, the congressional power applies; in the other, not. And when a river, improved by act of Congress, though running within only a single State, (as the James in Virginia, or the Penobscot, or Kennebec, in Maine,) is used for the transportation of articles of commerce beyond the limits of the State, then the appropriation for such improvement is brought within the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.

If these views be sound, then, although the proposition, that the power to regulate commerce "is restricted to the external commerce of the States with each other, to the exclusion of their internal," be in itself true, yet it is *not* true as a *reason* why that power does not apply as well to an improvement of a river running in only one State, as to that of a river running through half a dozen. Whether such improvement shall come within the power or not in a given case, must depend upon whether the river requiring it shall, or shall not, be navigable for the general commerce of the States. And this would be as true of a river running through a dozen States,

as we hold it to be of a river running through only one. Its *national navigability*, so to speak, and not its locality, in either case, whether bordered on by one State or a dozen, must determine its claim to national means for its improvement under the power to regulate commerce.

We come now to the second reason for the first proposition. It is stated in the form of a rule, with two exceptions to it. The *rule*, as stated, is, that the commerce of such rivers (as run within one State only) is under the exclusive control of the States within whose limits their navigable waters are confined. The *exceptions* are, *first*, "that no vessel from another State, coming or going, can be compelled to enter, clear or pay duties;" and *second*, that "vessels from other States shall not be subject to any regulation or law in navigating them, to which the vessels of the State to which they belong are not."

Now, this second reason (thus stated in the form of a rule) is, without the exceptions, merely a corollary from the first; for, if the power of Congress be denied over rivers running only in one State, the exclusive power of the State over such rivers must, of consequence, be admitted; and hence, all the argument just presented against the first reason, must be of equal force against the second, *unless* the second, as a rule, be placed upon different ground from the first by the exceptions connected with it. These exceptions could give that different ground, only by their effect to *establish* the rule, of which they assume the proof, and which they profess to qualify. Have the exceptions that effect? We think not, for two reasons: first, because the rule and the exceptions do not belong to the same category; and second, because, if they did, the exceptions are co-extensive with the rule, and by neutralizing, destroy it.

First. The rule and the exceptions do not belong to the same category. The exceptions are stated, as though they were limitations to the *power of a State* in the control of its rivers, &c.; whereas, as to the first of them, it is clearly only a limitation of the *general power of Congress* "to regulate commerce." This appears from two considerations: first, that it is found under the limitations of the powers of Congress in the arrangement of the

Constitution; second, it is essentially embraced within the proper business of regulating commerce, which, being exclusively in Congress, is prohibited to the States. As to the second exception, it is clearly entitled to no force, because the power denied by it to a State, would be as fully prohibited in the exclusive power in Congress to regulate commerce, as it possibly could be by the provision of immunity to the citizens of each State in every other State, on which the Report professes to found it. For, any discrimination in the rights of navigation in a particular State, between the citizens of such State and the citizens of other States, would be obviously an exercise of the power to regulate commerce; and hence, the exception, from whatever provision of the Constitution it may be drawn, may properly, if not *only*, be regarded, as a limitation upon the power of Congress to regulate commerce. The effect, then, of the exceptions is, not to prevent a State from doing a thing which, without them, it might have done, (for the subject matter of the exceptions being exclusively in Congress, a State could not, as has been seen, have done such a thing at any rate;) but simply and only to impose particular limitations upon the legislation of Congress, which, without these limitations, the general power to regulate commerce would have authorized. The States therefore stand, *with* the prohibitions, precisely where they would have stood *without* them. Hence, the second reason in support of the general proposition being entirely unaffected by the exceptions connected with it, leaves it liable, as we have said, to all the objections urged against the first,—being a mere corollary from it. But,

Second. Admitting the reason and the prohibitions to belong to the same category; admitting that they sustain to each other the relation of such exceptions; that the prohibitions refer to the power of the States over their internal commerce, and not to the power of Congress "to regulate commerce among the States;" still, the fact that everything is comprehended within the exceptions which could be necessary to a free and unlimited commerce among the States, makes the exceptions as broad as the rule, and, of course, nullifies it. What more, indeed, is necessary to a per-

fectly free and unlimited commerce among the States, than the liberty of entering any river or port of any State, without liability to duty on imports and exports, or to discriminating navigation charges? Vessels go from one State to another, through any river that may be navigable, whether running in one State only, or in many, and return again—going as they please, and carrying what they please, either way. What is this but the freest commerce among the States? and, in view of it, of what importance would be the rule, that rivers running within a single State are under the exclusive control of that State? Such control, at the most, could be only nominal. Nay, it would not be control, but, in fact, a *liability* on the part of such State to keep such rivers in navigable order, at its own expense, if kept in such order at all.

So much for the first proposition and the reasons offered to support it. We think we have shown the reasons to be utterly destitute of substance, and of course that the proposition, at least as depending upon these reasons, cannot be sustained.

The second proposition is, that the constitutional power of Congress over river obstructions, does not extend to such rivers as are confined to *two* States, whether dividing or running through them. We would here remark, that the whole of the preceding argument is as applicable to this second proposition as to the first; for if Congress have the power within *one* State, they must of course have it where *two* are concerned.

In order to understand the argument in support of this second proposition, and the commentary we shall make upon it, it is proper that we should quote at length the two following paragraphs from the Report:—

“The case of a river whose navigable waters are confined to two States, whether dividing or flowing through them, requires more particular and full explanation. The provision of the Constitution, already cited, which exempts vessels bound to or from one State from entering, clearing, or paying duties in another, would make all streams, in effect, common highways of all the States, and bring them exclusively under the control of the Federal Government, as far as the power to regulate commerce among the States is concerned—as much so, indeed, as the Mississippi itself—were it not for another provision in the same instrument.

They (the Committee) allude to that which provides that no State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any agreement or compact with another State; and which of course permits (with such consent) *one* State to enter into compact or agreement with *another*.

“To understand the intention of the framers of the Constitution for inserting this provision, and its bearing on the point under consideration, it is necessary to view it in connection with another provision of the instrument already cited. They (the Committee) refer to that which prohibits the States from entering into any treaty, alliance, or confederation in any case whatever; plainly because it would be both dangerous and inconsistent with their federal relations to permit it. In order to prevent so important a provision from being eluded, the provision immediately under consideration was inserted, prohibiting the States from entering into agreements or compacts in any case whatever, except one State with another State, or with a foreign power; and to prevent the abuse even of that limited power, the consent of Congress is required. Such is the prohibition and the reason for it. The reason for the exception is, that without it the prohibition would substitute the federal authority for that of the States, for the adjustment and regulation of all the various subjects in which the several States may have a mutual interest in adjusting and regulating, including such as the one under consideration; and thereby would give greater extension and minuteness to the authority of the General Government than was desirable or consistent with the objects for which it was instituted. Under the exception, it is left to the States, when only two are interested in the navigation of a river, or any other object, to take it under their own jurisdiction and control, by an agreement or compact between them with the consent of Congress; as much so as it would be under that of one if it was confined exclusively to one instead of extending to two.”

My main purpose, in reference to these two paragraphs, is to discuss them together, with a view to the effect of the connection of the two prohibitory clauses of the Constitution referred to in them, to support the proposition under consideration.

In the second paragraph, then, the author asserts, that in order to understand the proper meaning of the clause, “No State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any agreement or compact with another State,” and its bearing upon the point under consideration, it is necessary to consider it in connection with another provision of the Constitution, providing that “no State shall enter into any

treaty, alliance, or confederation." The two clauses considered together, then, are thus: *First*, "No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation." *Second*, "No State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any agreement or compact with another State." Now, the connection of these two clauses together, has, as is declared in the Report, a twofold object: *first*, the intention of the framers of the Constitution for the insertion of the clause in question, (that is, the first of the clauses above quoted;) and *second*, to show the bearing of that clause on the point under consideration.

As to the first of these objects, it will be observed, that the reason, and the sole reason, given by the Report for the insertion of the *last* clause as above quoted, was to prevent the elusion of the *first*. This reason, of course, logically implies that the first clause comprehended all that was expressed in the second, but which, not being expressed in the first, might be eluded. But this reason could not be the true one; for if it were, the last clause would simply say, "No State shall enter into any agreement or compact with another," without adding, "without the consent of Congress." This addition carries the clause beyond the reason asserted for the introduction of it, and of course indicates some other reason for it than that affirmed by the Report. What that other reason is, will appear directly.

As to the second object of the connection of the two clauses, viz., to show the bearing of the last clause upon the point under consideration, it will be borne in mind that the "point under consideration" is, that the constitutional power of Congress does not extend to such rivers as are confined to two States; and the inquiry is as to the "bearing" upon that "point" of the clause, "No State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any agreement or compact with another State." Now, it is evidently the meaning of the Report, in the connection of the two clauses, that this "bearing" can have no other relation to this "point" than as it refers to the distinction between the power of Congress over rivers bordered by three States, and the want of that power over rivers confined to two. For, as the Report assumes the existence of the power

in the first class of cases, the distinction must presuppose that the clause was inserted with a sole reference to two States, and of course can be applicable to no possible case that shall be predicated of them. This distinction is evidently deduced by the Report from such a reading of the two clauses as makes their *terms* reciprocally *equivalent*, and their *objects identical*. Now we deny the correctness of this reading, and maintain that the terms, "treaty, alliance and confederation," in the one clause, have an entirely different meaning, and refer to entirely different subjects matter, from the terms "agreement and compact" in the other. We maintain that a larger meaning and application were intended by the former terms than by the latter; that the terms "compact and agreement," referred to minor matters of arrangements between the States, such as regulations of mutual police, boundary, jurisdiction, &c.; and that the terms "treaty, alliance and confederation," referred to the higher negotiations of international diplomacy; the first being permitted *with* the consent of Congress, and the last absolutely prohibited *with or without* such consent.

That the reading of the two clauses here suggested is the true one, appears to us to be sustained by several obvious considerations. In the first place, we would say, that the detached form in which the two clauses are presented, affords the strongest *prima facie* evidence that they referred to entirely different subjects; and that if the one had been intended as a qualification of the other, it would have been so expressed. The distinction, too, between foreign relations and home relations, as predicable of the several States, was a sufficient reason for the insertion of the two clauses: the first clause using terms suited to the diplomatic dignity, and the last clause, the domestic simplicity, of the classes of subjects to which they respectively referred. And then, again, the qualification, "with the consent of Congress," in the one clause, and the absence of that or any other qualification in the other, cannot leave a doubt that entirely different topics were in the minds of the Convention, in the contemplation of the two clauses, respectively. The matter is made still clearer by considering the wisdom of the distinction between the

unqualified prohibition in the one clause, and the only qualified prohibition in the other: the first putting negotiations for treaties, alliances and confederations—importing the relations of peace, war, and the largest range of international politics—entirely beyond the power of the States, even with the consent of Congress; the last, leaving smaller matters—embracing topics of public convenience, boundaries, local jurisdictions, and the like—subjects to compact or agreement with the consent of Congress. The first were the subjects of *unqualified* prohibition, because they were of a class of which it could never be proper that any State should take cognizance. The last were the subjects of *qualified* prohibition, because they were of a class upon which it might be highly convenient that the States should be at liberty to negotiate, provided the cases made were such as should be justly entitled to the assent of Congress.

Now, this reading of the two clauses makes them entirely independent of each other; and, while it presents in them two substantive and distinct matters, each of moment, for the Constitution to act upon, and furnishes the true reason for the insertion of the "agreement and compact" clause, it at the same time vindicates the Convention from the imputation of an afterthought and repetition in one clause, to relieve a slovenly omission or imperfection in another.

But, if these views be just; if there be nothing in the reason presented by the Report for the insertion of the clause in question; and if it be true, that the two prohibitory clauses refer to entirely different objects, and have no more relation to each other than any other two independent clauses in the Constitution; then it is clear, that their connection together in this discussion sheds no light upon the matter which the Report intends to illustrate, and fails to establish the proposition which it affirms.

We have thus far discussed, together, the two paragraphs quoted from the Report, with reference to the effect of the connection of the two prohibitory clauses of the Constitution referred to in them, upon the proposition under consideration; and here, perhaps, so far as the repetition of that proposition is concerned, we might safely

rest. But there are some matters in the second paragraph,* standing separately

* There is also a matter in the *first* paragraph, which, though not, as we conceive, vital to the discussion, we still regard as worthy of attention, either as conveying a doctrine singularly erroneous, or as betraying a looseness of thought or a slovenliness of expression, quite discreditable, in my judgment, to the author of the Report. A careful analysis of this first paragraph gives the following proposition, viz., that the provision of the Constitution exempting vessels bound to or from one State, from entering, clearing or paying duties in another, would bring all such streams as are confined to two States exclusively under the control of the Federal Government, as much so as the Mississippi itself, so far as the power to regulate commerce is concerned, *were it not* for another provision of the Constitution, providing that "no State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any agreement or compact with another State." Now the author may not mean what this language clearly imports; but, if he does, it appears to me to contain a most extraordinary statement, leading to a result more extraordinary still; for, unless we greatly misapprehend that language, such result must be in direct conflict with the previous proposition of the Report, claiming the control of the Mississippi and all its navigable tributaries, bordered by three States, as coming within the power of Congress "to regulate commerce." This will appear from what follows.

We understand the statement, then, to affirm two things:

First, that were it not for the prohibitory clause quoted in it, Congress would have the exclusive control over such streams as are bordered by only two States; and, *second*, that this control would come, not from the power to regulate commerce, but from the clause exempting vessels going from one State to another, from payment of duties, &c. And as the control thus ascribed to Congress, and so originating, would be possessed, as the proposition declares, to the same extent as over "the Mississippi itself," we might suppose, without anything further, that it was intended to ascribe the power of controlling the Mississippi itself to the exempting clause also. But it will be remembered that, in a preceding part of the Report, the control over the Mississippi is ascribed to the power to regulate commerce, without any allusion to the exempting clause. Supposing the Report to mean this, and supposing also the prohibitory clause above quoted out of the way, the proposition makes the control which Congress would, in such case, have over rivers confined to two States, to stand upon different ground from that which it has over rivers extending to more States than two. And hence, as the proposition, in reference to the power in the first class of cases, assumes the exempting clause as its proper source, and in connection with it, specifically bases the distinction, giving the control of Congress over rivers bordered by three States, on the one hand, and denying that control over rivers confined to two States, on the other, upon the sole ground of the clause that "no State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into an agreement or compact with another State," it must follow, as the opinion of the Report, that, in the absence of both the exempting and prohibitory clauses from the Constitution, the power of Congress to regulate commerce would extend only to rivers bordered by three States, to the exclusion of those confined to two or only one. Now, as this distinction precedes all discussion of the effect of either the exempting or prohibitory clauses, we have a right to demand, especially of a *strict constructionist*, that he show us that clause of the Constitution by

from the first, which we deem vital to this discussion, and which we cannot pass over without notice. Thus, in the first place, the Report says, "In order to prevent so important a provision from being eluded, (that is, the provision that "no State should enter into any treaty, alliance or confederation,") the provision immediately under consideration was inserted, prohibiting the States from entering into agreements or compacts in any case whatever, except one State with another State, or with a foreign power; and to prevent the abuse even of that *limited power*, the consent of Congress is required." Now, here is a jumble and confusion of words and ideas, utterly amazing in a mind so remarkable for precision as Mr. Calhoun's. The *text* of the Constitution is, "No State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any agreement or compact with another State or with a foreign power." Mr. Calhoun's interpretation or paraphrase of this text is, that the States are prohibited from entering into any agreements or compacts in any case whatever, "except one State with another State, or with a foreign power." This exception in favor of "one State with another State," &c., he calls a "limited power," to prevent the abuse of which the "consent of Congress" is required. The text declares a *prohibition* with a *qualification*, viz., the consent of Congress. The interpretation declares a *limited power* with a *restraint*, viz., the consent of Congress; and what is very curious is, that this very element in the text, viz., the consent of Congress, which imposes this restraint, is the very source from which the power restrained is derived. For, take away from the text the phrase, "without the consent

of Congress," and you have the naked unqualified prohibition thus: "No State shall enter into any agreement or compact with another." Take from the text that phrase, and Mr. Calhoun would hardly be supposed capable of the absurdity of construing the remainder anything but an absolute prohibition, much less a limited power. And yet, strange as it may seem, he has, in effect, committed this absurdity, by separating, in his paraphrase, that part of the sentence which speaks of the prohibition—with one exception, creating a limited power—from that part which refers to the consent of Congress as a restraint, to prevent that limited power from being abused. He has, in effect, declared, that the words, "No State shall enter into any agreement or compact with another State," convey a grant of power(!), "to prevent the abuse of which, the consent of Congress is required."

But the whole idea of a grant of limited power, or power in any sense, is quite absurd. It must be observed, that the terms of the clause are *prohibitory* and not *permissive*. A State *shall not* do a certain thing, *without* consent of Congress—not a State *may* do a certain thing, *with* such consent. The purpose of the clause is to *deny* a power, not to *grant* one; to *prevent* something from being done, not to *promote* it; and the consent of Congress, if given, must be considered as given *against* a rule and not as *fulfilling* one. Hence the power which a State might exercise with the consent of Congress, is, to all practical intents, dead, until such consent be asked and given; and therefore the clause, until such consent be asked, in a given case, must be regarded as though it were not in the

which, expressly or by implication, that distinction can be sustained; and, if he cannot show it, as he most assuredly cannot, then we are at liberty to place the two cases on precisely the same ground, as regards the power of Congress to regulate commerce; and as the Report denies, in the case supposed, that that power would extend to the case of a river bordered by only two States, we, on our part, deny that it extends to the case of one bordered by three. The result is, that in the absence of the exempting and prohibitory clauses in question, the naked power to regulate commerce alone remaining, that power would not extend at all to the improvement of rivers running in one, two, or a dozen States. All the argument of the Report then, in favor of the general proposition of the power of Congress to facilitate commerce by removing impediments to navigation, drawn from the power to regulate commerce, must fall to the ground.

This conclusion, the author of the Report could

not, of course, have thought of; and yet, it is believed, it cannot be escaped. For if the proposition of the Report be correct, that the power of Congress over rivers bordered by three States is derived from the power to regulate commerce, and if the power over rivers confined to two States, in the absence of the exempting and prohibitory clauses, is, in fact, referable to the same source, it follows that the latter power, if it exist anywhere, belongs as well to Congress as the former; which latter proposition the Report, in effect, denies. Now, to escape the dilemma, the Report must either abandon what it claims in reference to three States, or yield what it denies in reference to two; and if the prohibitory clause, relied upon to prove the power wanting in the one case, shall be conclusive to that end, then the power in the other must share the same fate, and river and harbor improvements, under the auspices of the nation, be dispensed with altogether.

Constitution. Now the whole assumption of the Report assumes the reverse of this; for, in making the qualified prohibition of two States to enter into an agreement, in relation to a river confined within them, to work the effect of taking from Congress all power over such river, is in effect to assume that such qualified prohibition was in fact no prohibition, but an affirmative power; that the prohibition at most was merely nominal; as though the consent would certainly be asked if it were wanted, and granted if it were asked. The case would be different if the power, instead of being *prohibited* without the consent of Congress, had been *given* unless prohibited by Congress. In the last case, a State might act unless stopped; in the first, it could not act unless permitted. The first case might of itself furnish no absolute refutation of the proposition of the Report; the last, in our judgment, if there be any such thing as inconsistency of ideas, makes it impossible that the proposition should be true.

To conclude, in a word, this point in the discussion, our proposition would be this: that the power to "enter into treaties, alliances and confederations," and the power "to make agreements and compacts," both existed in the States anterior to the Constitution; but that instrument prohibited the former *absolutely*, and the latter, *except when all the States, through Congress, should assent*.

But something worthy of attention still remains in the paragraph in hand. The Committee having found an exception to the prohibition, in favor of "*one State with another State*," feel bound to give a reason for it. That reason is, that, without the exception, "the prohibition would substitute the federal authority for that of the States for the adjustment and regulation of all the various subjects in which the several States may have an interest in adjusting and regulating, including such as the one under consideration, and thereby would give greater extension and minuteness to the authority of the Federal Government, than was desirable or consistent with the objects for which it was instituted." This language is cool and oracular—uttered, evidently, as though felt to be undeniable, and intended clearly to be impressed as by authority. Now, we affirm every syllable of it to be

utterly gratuitous; without a word in the Constitution to sustain it, or a thought in the necessity of the case to suggest it. It defines what is "desirable or consistent with the objects for which the Federal Government was instituted," in reference to its "authority," by a purely arbitrary rule, and one, (in its application to *two* States as distinguished from three or more, as the objects of the exception,) without even the semblance of a reason. If the argument from "greater extension and minuteness," had any force, it must apply to *subjects matter* of authority, and not to the *parties*, whether two States or three, that might be interested in them. For nothing can be clearer, than that the authority of the Federal Government, in the adjusting and regulating of various objects "in which the several States may have a mutual interest," may be quite as important, in given instances, in its exercise upon two States as three; and any discrimination between them, such as the Report proposes, might, and probably would, often work the rankest injustice, if not the greatest danger. But as the proposition is offered without support, I may leave it, without further comment, to fall by its own weight.

A single other matter in the paragraph under consideration, is entitled to notice. "Under the exception," the paragraph goes on to say, "it is left to the States, when only two are interested in the navigation of a river, or on any other subject, to take it under their own exclusive jurisdiction and control by an agreement or compact between them, *with the consent of Congress*." With the consent of Congress! But suppose this consent in a given case should be refused? A work of vital moment to the two States—perhaps to the Union—goes unaccomplished. The States cannot do it, because Congress will not permit them to make a compact; and Congress cannot do it, because their power to permit the States to do it operates a prohibition to themselves. There can be no escape from this dilemma, except by assuming that the consent of Congress would be always, in all cases, certain; which would be, virtually, to annihilate the clause in the Constitution that requires it. This effect must, of course, make such an assumption inadmissible in practice, as it certainly is in theory. Now, can a result such as

this, in the action of this government, be regarded in any other light than as destroying all claim to confidence in any proposition that shall lead to it? We trust our system is not quite so weak, puerile and, we may add, unworthy, as the truth of such a proposition would presuppose it. In our judgment, the point is worthy of serious discussion, only in consideration of the source from which it comes.

We here close what we designed to offer upon the two paragraphs of the Report, whether singly or together; but before leaving the second general proposition which we undertook to discuss, and upon which the two paragraphs referred to have so material a bearing, we shall offer a few general reasons why, in our judgment, that proposition cannot be sustained.

First. It is, to our mind, a most serious objection to the doctrine of the Report, that it is of indefinite application as to the subjects of it. It will be observed that the Report specifically applies the operation of the clause, "No State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any agreement or compact with another," only to the power of Congress "to regulate commerce." Now are there not other provisions of the Constitution to which that operation may be applied with just as much propriety as to this? We maintain that there are; and in this, we are borne out by the Report itself, when it declares that there are "various subjects in which the several States are mutually interested in adjusting and regulating," which come within its doctrine. Now there are, at least, a dozen of these "various subjects" which might be mentioned, in entire consistency with the reasoning and admission of the Report, and coming within the doctrine; but we shall name only one. How, then, for instance, stands the clause, that "vessels bound to or from one State, shall not be obliged to enter, clear or pay duties in another?" To our mind, the application of the principle in question to this clause, forming an exception to it, would be just as legitimate, as it is to the clause giving to Congress the general power to regulate commerce: nay, even more so; for there is a reason of high justice for its application in the former case, if it be applicable in the latter, in the fact, that as, by its latter application, the two States

interested are deprived of the aid of the General Government in necessary improvements of a river for navigation, they would clearly be entitled to levy duties upon vessels coming from other States, in order to supply the means of making such improvements themselves. This power of levying duties, in the case supposed, is manifestly sustained by the just principle of compensation; for, as other States have the advantage of a navigation, made practicable and useful by the sole means of the two States, they are, in equity, bound to contribute in the only way they can, to reimburse those two States the expenditures to which they have been subjected for the general accommodation. Now is Mr. Calhoun prepared for a consequence like this, of the doctrine of his Report? We apprehend not. Nevertheless, we see not how he can escape it, unless by assuming the Constitution to be a mere convenience, to suit particular occasions, such as caprice may select, or a miserable jumble of contradictions, denying the uniform and equal justice which it professes to secure.

Second. In connection with the objection just offered, and without the advantage of the exception suggested in it, in favor of the power of two States, in the case supposed, to levy duties, &c., it may be urged as a conclusive and overwhelming argument against the proposition of the Report, that its operation would work the most monstrous injustice upon the States to which its principle would attach. Two States, for instance, as New-York and New-Jersey, border upon the same river. This river is open to the commercial enterprise of all the other States; thousands of the inhabitants of the latter States trace their fortunes to the navigation of it; the nation at large, by universal consent, derive annually millions of profit from it; and yet the two States, at an enormous annual expense, and by a standing compact, (Congress kindly consenting to it,) must keep such river in order! the common national purse giving back nothing of the enormous gains thus constitutionally realized by the whole confederacy, from the constitutional plunder of a *part*! And more and worse than all this: when the two States implore of the nation relief from such a load of injustice, they are insultingly told that, to relieve them, would be to interfere with

their State rights! They have exclusive control of the river; and any interference of Congress to remove obstructions from it, for the general good, would be an outrage upon their proper State dignity and honor. We have heard much of State rights, and of nullification to vindicate them. The Report introduces us to a new category—State wrongs; but says nothing of nullification to redress them!

A third objection is, that the proposition of the Report, ascribing the control of Congress over rivers bordered by three States to the power to regulate commerce, cannot stand consistently with the proposition under consideration.

It will be observed that the whole force of the argument of the Report, for the discrimination which it sets up between three States and two, in regard to the power of Congress over rivers, turns upon the assumption that two States may make a compact, but that three or more cannot. It follows, hence, that if three or more States could make a compact, their case in regard to the power in question would stand upon the same ground that the case of two does; and, as the Report excludes the latter from the power, it must necessarily exclude the former also. Now if the "treaty, alliance and confederation" clause were not in the Constitution, it is admitted that three or more States might make a compact, as well as two; and that, hence, in such case, the power in question would be no more applicable to the case of rivers in three or more States, than to that of rivers confined to two. Now, the necessary effect of this view is, to make the power ascribed to Congress over rivers bordered by three or more States, to come, in point of fact, from the "treaty, alliance and confederation" clause. But the Report, in terms, ascribes the power to the clause giving to Congress the power "to regulate commerce among the States." Now, it is quite clear that the power cannot come from both of these clauses; much less, sometimes from the one, and sometimes from the other, as may suit the convenience of some present purpose. It must come certainly, definitely, and under all relations, from only one of them, if it comes from either. Now this power comes from the clause "to regulate commerce," or it does not. If it does, then

the reasoning of the Report, founded on the "treaty, alliance and confederation" clause, must fall to the ground. But the reasoning of the Report, upon the matter under consideration, consciously or unconsciously to its author, presupposes that clause, as is shown above; and therefore, for all the purposes of this argument, the clause "to regulate commerce" must be considered as inapplicable. And hence, as without the "treaty, alliance and confederation" clause, three or more States might make a compact; and as it is, according to the Report, because two States may make a compact under the "agreement and compact" clause, that Congress is denied the power over rivers confined to such two States; it follows, that, in the absence of the "treaty, alliance and confederation" clause, (three States being, in such case, enabled to make a compact,) the power of Congress over rivers bordered by such other States, must be denied also—the clause "to regulate commerce" notwithstanding.

Now, this reasoning, to make the Report consistent, requires that it shall abandon either its proposition that the power of Congress over rivers running in three States or more, comes from the clause "to regulate commerce," or the proposition under discussion—which claims that that power does not extend to cases of rivers running in only two States. Which of the two propositions the Report shall abandon, remains for itself to say. Our purpose alone is to prove, that its adherence to the first proposition is a conclusive objection to the tenableness of the last.

A fourth objection to the proposition under consideration is, that it assumes a reading of the "agreement and compact" clause, which is not borne out by the good sense of the case, or by acknowledged rules of legal interpretation. This reading limits the application of the clause to two States only, where there is every reason for applying it to all of them. When it is said that "No State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into agreements or compacts with another," we understand the meaning to be, that the States, generally, are prohibited from making agreements with each other, in any number, whether two or ten, without the consent of Congress. This view, we say, is clearly

sustained by the obvious reasons for the insertion of the clause, as already explained; these reasons being just as applicable to any other number of States as to two. It is as clearly borne out by acknowledged rules of legal interpretation; for should a law declare that "no man shall do this or that thing," without a certain penalty, every lawyer must say, that it is not one man merely that is embraced in the provision, but every combination of men, no matter what the number who might, by violating such provision, come within its bearing. The clause in question, we maintain, stands on the same ground.

We proceed now to the third proposition of the Report which we proposed to consider, viz.: That the power "to regulate commerce" cannot be exercised in the construction of harbors for commerce, but only those for *shelter*.

Three arguments are urged by the Report in support of this proposition: First, that the States, in the exercise of the power of regulating commerce, never extended it to the improvement or construction of harbors for commerce—neither subsequent to, nor before the Revolution, while colonies. This, if true, is an extraordinary fact; but the inference drawn from it is more extraordinary still. No one will be so absurd as to say, that harbors are not indispensable to commerce. The question then is, who shall build them? Undoubtedly the public, through its proper government. You cannot expect individuals to do it, it being "beyond their means." Each of the States, then, certainly after the commencement of the Revolution, and before the adoption of the Constitution, must have had the power to build them; and if they did not exercise the power, it was not because they did not possess it, but because they had no occasion to use it. They probably had harbors enough already, and which had grown at different points on the Atlantic coast so gradually, as that their growth was not particularly observed, and made no mark in the history of the times. There certainly were harbors then as there are now; and they were built by somebody; and to say that the particular State governments did not build them, is to say what all rational probabilities pronounce to be untrue. But, at any rate, it is no necessary, or at least,

conclusive argument against the existence of a power, that it is not exercised; especially in a case like this, where the necessity of its exercise, in the infant growth of a continent of States, must be so infrequent compared with the whole extent of country, as to make no distinct impression when it occurred. The States, then, we hold, must have possessed the power to build commercial harbors at the period of the adoption of the Constitution; and being so possessed by them, it must, according to the admission of the Report, have passed over to the present national government, under the power "to regulate commerce."

The second argument of the Report against the power of Congress to build harbors for commerce, viz., that they must necessarily be located within the limits of individual States, and therefore be controlled by them, has already been answered in what we have said in relation to the regulation of commerce within the limits of a single State. A harbor must have a locality within a single State, or nowhere. And to say that because it is so, therefore it is not a proper subject of congressional legislation, is simply to beg the question; and there we leave it.

The third argument, viz., that the Constitution discriminates between the powers of a State to levy duties on imports and exports on the one hand, and on tonnage on the other, giving the net proceeds of the first to the national treasury, and reserving those of the last to the treasury of the State, appears to me to be founded in perfectly arbitrary conjecture, sustained neither by the history of the government, nor the reason of the thing. There are a hundred purposes to which a tonnage duty might be applied with equal propriety as to that of building harbors; and it is worthy of a moment's thought, that harbors must be built before the duty can be levied; so that the question stands open for discussion before the fact can exist upon which the argument is predicated. Why it should be assumed and asserted as a fact that the tonnage duty which might be levied by a State, was intended for the single purpose of building harbors, and for no other, we cannot comprehend; and before we will believe the fact, we demand the proof; and until this comes, we shall regard the assertion of it as

another begging of a question. But, further, it must be borne in mind, that "the consent of Congress" must precede this levying of a tonnage duty by a State; and as this consent may be refused, the argument in hand is liable to the objection already urged against the argument deduced, for another purpose, from the power of two States to make a compact, to which the same contingency is attached.

The distinction between a harbor for commerce and a harbor for shelter, is, to our apprehension, utterly without meaning. The only possible difference between the two, that we can see, is, between a vessel's lying at a wharf to take in lading for a voyage, and her lying at the same place to wait the passing of a storm. There is a wharf in either case, and it serves both purposes equally well; and why we should not be permitted to call that a "facility" to commerce which gives the convenience of shipping the freight that is the substance of it, as well as that which protects from the winds the vessel in which such freight is shipped, may be a curious question for the wits of a metaphysical de-

bating club of very young men, but, in our judgment, is utterly unworthy a moment's attention of a practical statesman.

We here conclude a discussion—already too long protracted—which we regret has not fallen to abler hands. There are those who think the Report which we have examined, refutes itself, and therefore requires no elaborate criticism to expose its errors. This may or may not be just. Whether so or not, however, there is a power about Mr. Calhoun's name and position, which would make it worse than in bad taste, to regard any state paper slightly that comes from his pen. He is, without doubt, one of the master minds of this country and age; and thousands take their law implicitly from his opinions, however extravagant in themselves, or feeble in the argument that would sustain them. It is to such, that we would especially address what we have said, in the hope, that though we may not succeed in producing conviction, we shall not entirely fail to awaken thought.

W. G.

Cincinnati, Dec., 1847.

THE ANGLO-SAXON RACE.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE CAUSES OF ITS UNRIVALLED PROGRESS, WITH SOME CONSIDERATIONS INDICATIVE OF ITS FUTURE DESTINY.

THE present age is developing, with startling rapidity, the national characteristics of races which must ultimately be subordinated to one. Inquiry has recently received a new impulse, and the future complexion of society is rousing the attention of the statesman, the philosopher and scholar. Whatever results may spring from their investigations, it is obvious that, even now, the means of stimulating and directing successful inquiry are neither few nor sparsely distributed. On the other side of the Atlantic societies have been formed, and volumes published,* for our information as to the long-neglected literature of "our noble ancestors;" and we propose to furnish some brief *indicia* to a more intimate

understanding and appreciation of their labors and wants—to seize some prominent traits of social excellence early exhibited, and trace them through all the vicissitudes of time down to our own age.

It is wise, at times, to fathom the mystic future; to scan the coming age, and sketch its characteristics and destinies, through the light of the present. And though the veil which conceals its imprint be closed to our view by an all-wise Providence, yet nature instinctively urges us to trace the influence of the present on the future history of our descendants. It is the closing prayer of the patriot to his successors, *remember the deeds of your fathers, and by them receive guidance for the future.*

When man first issued forth from Babel's plain, his domains were assigned him.

* Among others, *Palgrave's and Allen's*, (noticed in *Warren's Law Studies*, pp. 161, 162, 163.)

Each form where blend the lily and the rose was fixed in a cool and fertile clime.* Each frame whose swarthy hue distinguished its possessor from his "fellow dust," departed for the torrid vales of Africa. Yet, age after age and convulsion after convulsion have passed, and the former have retained the most of their primitive excellence wherever fate may have cast their lot. And now the European sweats under Congo's sultry sky, or shivers beneath the polar blast. The Englishman and American of the nineteenth century meet amid the palmy groves of Ceylon, or the coral isles of the Pacific, and hail each other brother. Over "the steppes" of Central Asia, or through the forests of the wild New-Hollander, they shout the watchword, *Onward, onward*.

There must be some elements which furnish the key to such a vast superiority over their fellows; as we shall carefully establish hereafter. These will meet us—they have forced themselves upon the notice of every other race; and we shall consider these characteristics somewhat more in detail. It is (among other causes, less obvious, though, perhaps, not less important) to their *moral integrity*, their ceaseless *enterprise*, (their roving habits stimulated by *natural* inquisitiveness, and improved by their advantages,) their intellectual *activity*, and, lastly, to the *social elevation of women*, we assign this pre-eminence.

1. At present it might appear as singular as it will be found true, that the Anglo-Saxon race has ever been distinguished from all others, by moral elevation, by religious fervor. How much of this should be attributed to a direct interposition of the Deity in their behalf,† and how much, on the other hand, belongs to their own silent efforts, we need not determine. But if an attentive view be cast upon them in their earliest and most simple "strivings" after the sublime idea of a God, in their more remote endeavors to *grasp* that of "the Increate," *not dimly* seen by them in His works—a hope would arise that such an investigation may be amply repaid.

* To this fact Humboldt ascribes the superiority of the inhabitants of temperate climes over all others. (*Am. Review*, June, 1846, p. 600) "Though the desire and feeling be common to all, they alone are able to satisfy it."

† Something strongly confirmative of this conjecture may be found in Ward's "Lectures on Ancient Israel," noticed in "The Anglo-American," Jan. 24, 1846.

"Our first authentic accounts of England, are at the landing of Caesar, nearly two thousand years ago." The merest school-boy is familiar with the pages of the author-warrior, and we need not dilate upon the character and spirit of the ancient Britons. Yet we cannot pass over the Druids—whose name generally awakens vague conceptions of barbaric priests chaunting their hymns to some bloody deity in the recesses of the forest, and, amid the over-hanging rocks, invoking his protection, or soliciting his favor by the sacrifice of human victims. Perhaps our minds will start at the idea, that they were the political soul and guides of their several tribes, the life-blood of civil liberty, the unswerving champions of their people against the tyranny of the Romans; and yet such may have been the case—if we believe Caesar and Tacitus, such *was* the case.* The stern, mysterious rites of the Druids—with all their folly—reveal a spirit of religious activity only too widely stimulated. The direction of the current was right, but its impetuosity engendered the most terrible outrages. Then all England was a living representation of that vast, intangible and *darkly* impressive idea, a God—whose attributes corresponded to their own rude, mysterious feelings. Each plain was redolent with sacrifices—was vocal with the Druids' nightly reverence ascending to Him. Such ideas and expectations derived a thrilling impressiveness from their mighty, dark, and solemn forests†—their ceremonies performed during the hours sacred to repose, in the solemn shades of night, combined with the constant presence of His ministers among the people. To them the intercourse of their hoary priests seemed like a near approach from heaven, too dread and too sublimely real to be neglected. Whatever we may think of them as Christians, we cannot refuse the meed of praise to such pure-minded though heathen patriots. We can well sympathize with the heroic devotion of the Druids; for the religious teachers of our ancestors could "*fight*" as well as preach: they cherished a wild, patriotic

* *Tac. Annal.*, Lib. xiv. sec. xxx. (Murphy, p. 257, note.) *Hist. Lib. iv. sec. liv. Caesar, De Bel. Gal. passim.*

† *De Mor. Ger.*, ix. (Murphy, n. 5,) xliii., n. Agricola, xxvii. (n. 9)

feeling, productive and suggestive of civil liberty;* and, amid the systematic attempts of Rome, afterwards, favored with learning, wealth, *tact*, and the affection she had inspired, to erect an undivided sovereignty over the hearts and arms of the Anglo-Saxons, this same spirit has never decayed. First evinced when the intrepid Druids plunged from the smouldering hamlets of *Mona*,† preferring death to Roman servitude, and thus cheering the faith of their countrymen;‡ the counterpart may be observed, gifted with a more spiritual impersonation, amid the fires of Smithfield, and owning such men as Latimer and Ridley. But their defence (heroic as it must have been) was unavailing;§ for who could resist the colossal power, who could curb the iron legions, of "the seven-hilled city?" The extension of Roman authority generally softened and *subdued* the fierce valor of the Britons;|| and, as wave after wave of their more independent foes (the Piets) rolled down from the north, instead of manfully repelling the ferocious invaders, they invoked the aid of the Saxons,¶ who became more formidable as allies, than they ever could have become as enemies. During the Roman domination, the Britons had received some faint sparks of Christianity.** We have spoken of the Druids: it was on this predisposed stock that its pristine influences were grafted in their purity, and from the feelings to whose exhibitions we have alluded, they took their warmest, most ineffaceable impress. "The word of life" had reached them, and was received into the affections of a people whose earnest care and self-denying efforts have been to exhibit it to the world, and transmit it to others unimpaired. The enervating influence of excessive luxury, (which "*sævior armis incubuit, victum ulciscitur orbem*,") and the fires of persecution, have equally failed to crush its energies. Of the latter there were two: the first raged under Diocletian; and the Saxons, ferocious pagans as they were, soon annihilated the vestiges of a milder

faith, that yet remained linked with the singularly simple habits and unwavering fidelity of the Britons. We are frank to confess that this period was not so remarkable or important, *religiously* considered, as a future one. Probably the virtue and energy of the Britons are more conspicuous in their civil relations; for the first phase in the development of these germs of free institutions, that so slowly expanded afterwards, was here visible; and yet their attachment to religion must have been considerably operative, for it sustained them under the grinding oppression of the "mistress of the world," then ruled by one of her most ruthless tyrants. The astute and critical scholar, as his eye lingers with fond delight on the limnings of the brief, sententious Tacitus, will not fail to trace many offshoots from the rude institutions of the ancient Germans transplanted, developed, and now operative in our varied forms of social life, as well as our principles of government and modes of political procedure.* Probably they were one race with the Britons.† Of *both* it may be said, that "their souls were raised by taking a free part in concerns more dignified than those of individuals. The energy was awakened, which, after many ages of storm and darkness, qualified the Teutonic race to be the ruling portion of mankind, to lay the foundation of a better-ordered civilization than that of the eastern or ancient world, and finally to raise into the fellowship of those blessings the nations whom they had subdued." (Mackintosh, "England.")

The first permanent conversions to Christianity, occurred during the reign of Ethelbert, (A. D. 596,) and were accomplished by the enterprising devotion of St. Augus-

* *Mor. Ger.* iii. (*Murphy*, n. 5 and 8.)
 † *Annal.*, Lib. xiv. sec. 29 and 30; *Agric.*, xiv. (*Murphy*, n. 11.)
 ‡ *Agric.*, xviii.
 § *Ibid.* (*Murphy*, p. 600, *nota*.)
 || *Agric.* xiii. xviii., xx.-xxi. xxxiv.
 ¶ A. D. 446, (just 1400 years ago.)
 ** Fuller, *Ecc. Hist.*, (Load. Edit.,) vol. I. pp. 7, 17; Waddington, *idem*, p. 133.

* *Inter al.* "the hundreders," (*Mor. Ger.* vi. *Murphy*, note 9.) limited authority of their kings, vii.; the influence of woman over them, especially on the battle-field, vii. and viii.; customs of "wager of battles," "duel," &c., the origin of chivalry, *ibid.* note 4; their political assemblies, (*commune consilium*), the type of "the Wittenagemot," and origin, through it, of the British Constitution, xi. n. 5; reckoning by nights instead of days, *ibid.* n. 7; their punishments pecuniary, ("mulcts.") xx. xxi., illustrated by "Deodands," n. 4, and voluntary "tribute," xv., n. 6; Parliament (the influence of); reverence for the sanctity of the marriage relation, xviii. xix.; and influence of "Salique" law, xx. n. 1; and respect for the dead, xxvii.

† This seems to be the increasingly probable opinion of the best authorities; vide in connection, *Mor. Ger.* xl. (*Murphy*, note 6, *ibid.*)

time. From this period to the landing of William the Conqueror, the faith and confidence of the Anglo-Saxons (though subjected to trials and seductions of no ordinary character) met no annihilation. Here was the golden age of English religious energy; for no subsequent period has been marked by more unity of aim, by a more unswerving attachment to the doctrines and practice of the uncorrupted Christian church. That a more particular and satisfactory view of Anglo-Saxon Britain may be enjoyed, we shall take the liberty of quoting from a work, whose spirit and excellencies are appreciable by the simple-minded Christian, never unwelcome to the refined and critical scholar.* Our limits will permit but brief glances at some of the most prominent features of this age—an age whose records are crowded with an interesting portraiture of those who suffered, labored, and died, having accomplished the work allotted to them.

Little was the resistance to that strong incentive of propagating Christianity by the sword, in the minds of most northern monarchs, as is abundantly evident from the records of Swedish history.† No such conversions, however, took place in England; all was peaceful and voluntary.

"Mercia received the faith from the pious industry of the Northumbrian princes, who were eminently instrumental in the dissemination of Christianity among the numerous tribes of their countrymen. Peada, the son of Penda, King of Mercia, had offered his hand to the daughter of Oswin, the successor of Oswald; but the lady spurned the addresses of a pagan, and the passion of the prince induced him to study the principles of her religion. His conversion was rewarded with the object of his affection"—and he became a sincere adherent to the new faith.

Sussex was peopled by a fierce, intract-

able race, yet *Wilfrid's* superior zeal or address introduced Christianity even here.

"Expelled from his diocese by the intrigue of his enemies, he wandered an honorable exile among the tribes of the south, when Edilwalch, King of Sussex, who had been lately baptized, invited him to attempt the conversion of his subjects."

Thus, guided by the glowing pathos of his eloquence, his "slaves were first converted, and generously restored to their freedom on the day of their baptism;" an eloquent commentary on the sentiment, "he is free whom the truth makes free"—paralleled but once in the records of history, (that in the Sandwich Islands, to which we shall hereafter refer.)

"Thus in the space of about eighty years was successfully completed the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons; an enterprise which originated in the charity of Gregory the Great, and was unremittingly continued by the industry of his disciples, with the assistance of several faithful co-operators from Gaul and Italy."

"The acquisition of religious knowledge introduced a new spirit of legislation; the presence of the bishops and superior clergy improved the wisdom of the national councils; and laws were framed to punish the more flagrant violations of morality, and prevent the daily broils which harass the peace of society."

Even such, to this day, has been the state of Scandinavia—the primal germ again bursting forth, in fresher luxuriance; for the "House of the Clergy" there retains an elevating and conservative *check* upon the other branches of the legislature, and all who visit Sweden are surprised at the happy results of such influence.* Perhaps it may be useful to consider whether some slight imitation of this arrangement might not be practicable in our own body politic. That they are highly necessary, none who have sedulously noted public affairs, will fail to perceive.†

Then royalty, meekly obedient, sought the more permanent aid of religion, and worshipped at other shrines than those of lust, or passion, or ambition.

"In the clerical and monastic establishments, the most sublime of the Gospel virtues were carefully practiced: even kings descended from

* "*History and Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, by John Lingard, D. D." Philadelphia Edition, M. Fithian, 1844. Excellent as this volume is, there is much room for improvement. Some of our enterprising publishers might publish an edition containing judicious translations of the numerous Latin extracts which form a large portion of the body and notes of the work. Under the guidance of a good editor, other improvements might be made which would render it more adapted for the popular mind.

† Dr. Baird's Visit, (N. Y. Edi. 1841,) pp. 41, 123, *et alibi*.

* Dr. Baird's Visit, vol. II, p. 101, 176.

† Qu. 1—Ed.

their thrones, and exchanged the sceptre for the cowl. Their conduct was applauded by their contemporaries; and the moderns whose supercilious wisdom affects to censure it, must at least esteem the motives which inspired, and admire the resolution which completed the sacrifice. The progress of civilization kept equal pace with the progress of religion; not only the useful, but the agreeable arts were introduced; every species of knowledge which could be obtained, was eagerly studied; and during the gloom of ignorance which overspread the rest of Europe, learning found, for a certain period, an asylum among the Saxons of Britain." (Lingard, p. 35.)

Such names were given to the different sections of the country as have withstood the mutations of a thousand years: for instance, we have *Cent*, (Kent,) *South-Seaxe*, (Sussex,) *Oxenford*, (Oxford,) and *Grantebrige*, *North-Humber-land*, and numerous others. Such arrangements for the jurisdiction of the clergy, and their support, were originated, as have met very few changes in later ages. Canterbury then secured (after severe conflicts) its present pre-eminence, and the present system of *tithes* obtained as early as the year 750; but Offa, King of Mercia, first invested them with a legal relation, and Ethelwolf, about sixty years after, enlarged them for the whole kingdom of England.* At this early period, too, the right of temporal *investitures* was yielded to the king, and "as soon as any church became vacant, the ring and crosier, the emblems of episcopal jurisdiction, were carried to the king by a deputation of the chapter, and returned by him to the person whom they had chosen, with a letter by which the civil officers were ordered to maintain him in the possession of the lands belonging to his church." (Lingard.) This useful measure soon engendered intolerable abuses, though it was William Rufus who first "prostituted ecclesiastical dignities."†

* * * * *

We meet with interesting records of the conversion of Northumbria, of which Edwin was the puissant king. He

"Had asked and obtained the hand of Edilberga, the daughter of Ethelbert; but the zeal of her brother had stipulated that she should

enjoy the free exercise of her religion, and had extorted from the impatient suitor a promise, that he would impartially examine the credibility of the Christian faith. With these conditions Edwin complied, and alternately consulted the Saxon priests and Paulinus, a bishop who had accompanied the queen. Though the arguments of the missionary were enforced by the entreaties of Edilberga, the king was slow to resolve, and two years were spent in anxious deliberation. At length, attended by Paulinus, he entered the great council of the nation; requested the advice of his faithful Witau; and exposed the reasons which induced him to prefer the Christian to the pagan worship. Coiffi, the high priest of Northumbria, was the first to reply. It might have been expected, that prejudice and interest would have armed him with arguments against the adoption of a foreign creed; but his attachment to paganism had been weakened by repeated disappointments, and he had learned to despise the gods, who had neglected to reward his services. That the religion he had hitherto taught was useless, he attempted to prove from his own misfortunes, and avowed his resolution to listen to the reasons, and examine the doctrines of Paulinus. He was followed by an aged thane, whose discourse offers an interesting picture of the simplicity of the age. 'When,' said he, 'O king, you and your ministers are seated at the table in the depth of winter, and the cheerful fire blazes on the hearth in the middle of the hall, a sparrow, perhaps, chased by the wind and snow, enters at one door of the apartment, and escapes by the other. During the moment of its passage, it enjoys the warmth; when it is once departed, it is seen no more. Such is the nature of man. During a few years his existence is visible; but what has preceded, or what will follow it, is concealed from the view of mortals. If the new religion offer any information on these important subjects, it must be worthy of our attention.'

Right worthily spoken, though by one who never trod the starry halls of science! for, in the words of the poet—

"Nothing of life abideth! all is change!

Nor whence we came, and whither we shall go,
He knoweth who hath sent—nor deem it strange

If whence and whitherward the ocean's flow
Ages have known not, nor shall ever know."

"To these reasons the other members assented. Paulinus was desired to explain the principal articles of the Christian faith, and the king expressed his determination to embrace the doctrine of the missionary. When it was asked who would dare to profane the altars of Woden, Coiffi accepted the dangerous office. Laying aside the emblems of the priestly dig-

* Black. Comm. pp. 25, 26.

† Fuller, vol. i. p. 279.

nity, he assumed the dress of a warrior; and despising the prohibitions of the Saxon superstition, mounted the favorite charger of Edwin. By those who were ignorant of his motives, his conduct was attributed to a temporary insanity. But he disregarded their clamors, proceeded to the nearest temple, and, bidding defiance to the god of his fathers, hurled his spear into the sacred edifice. It stuck in the opposite wall; and, to the surprise of the trembling spectators, the heavens were silent, and the sacrilege was unpunished. Insensibly they recovered from their fears, and, encouraged by the exhortation of Coifi, burnt to the ground the temple and the surrounding grove.*

For the instruction of the clergy, seminaries were founded, in which,

"With the assistance of the best masters, the young ecclesiastics were initiated in the different sciences which were studied at that period, while the restraint of a wise and vigilant discipline withheld them from the seductions of vice, and inured them to the labors and duties of their profession. According to their years and merit, they were admitted to the lower orders of the hierarchy; and might, with the approbation of their superior, aspire at the age of five-and-twenty to the rank of deacon, at thirty to that of priest."

Nor were these provisions for education confined to the monasteries. The great mass of the common people shared in the labors and instructions of the missionaries.

"Bede has drawn an interesting picture of the avidity with which the simple natives of the most neglected cantons were accustomed to hasten, on the first appearance of a missionary, to beg his benedictions and listen to his instructions; and the celebrated St. Cuthbert frequently spent whole weeks and months in performing the priestly functions among the most mountainous and uncultivated parts of Northumbria." (P. 51.)

"The priests were exhorted to be satisfied with the revenue of their churches; and the severest censures awaited him who presumed to demand a retribution for the discharge of his functions."

To prevent the secularization of their minds, (the necessity of which is painfully evinced by the history of the Moravian missionaries in Greenland,) many arrangements were sedulously carried out. Among

others, the practice of *celibacy* was fully operative. Indeed, although every age has marked the prevalence of this sentiment, none has presented brighter examples of its faithful observance. From their early teachers were derived the instances of its carefully-instilled importance; and we are almost ready to agree with Lingard, that

"Had Augustine and his associates been involved in the embarrassments of marriage, they would never have torn themselves from their home and country, and have devoted the best portion of their lives to the conversion of distant and unknown barbarians." (p. 57.)

It was, probably, the consideration of such sentiments that afterwards induced Bacon to say: "He that hath wife and children hath given hostages to fortune; for they are impediments to great enterprises, either of virtue or mischief. Certainly the best works, and of the greatest merit for the public, have proceeded from the unmarried or the childless man, which both in affection and means have married and endowed the public. . . . Unmarried men are best friends, best masters, best servants. . . . A single life doth well with churchmen; for charity will hardly water the ground where it must first fill a pool." Seneca, it seems, was of the same opinion: "*Vita conjugalis altos et generosos spiritus frangit, et a magnis capitacionibus ad humillimas detrahit.*" (*Ibid.*, p. 58.)

Without entering on the discussion of this question, we may briefly mention that these are the times when no such principles are in vogue—that the moderns will hearken to no opinion of this kind; and yet we are not certain that enthusiastically unselfish, vital piety is any more extensively prevalent now, than when the self-denying earnestness of Anglo-Saxon religion graced England with those exemplars, which after years have delighted to commemorate, though, perhaps, not to imitate.*

In his third chapter Dr. Lingard passes, by a natural digression, to the temporal support of the ministers of religion. It was derived from *donations of land*, termed "glebe lands," (which were exempt from

* Alcuin has celebrated the fame of Coifi in his poem on the Church of York:

"O nimum tanti felix audacia facti,
Polluit ante alios quas ipse sacraverat aras."
(Pp. 25, 26.)

* There are of course two sides in this question. Mackintosh, "*Hist. Eng.*," vol. I., cap. 2, pp. 46-50, has sketched the origin of clerical celibacy, and the corruption engendered by it.

taxation;) from the voluntary oblations of the people; from *tithes*, whose institution has been noticed above; and various other charities, as "the plough alms," (consisting of one penny for every hide of arable land, exacted within fifteen days after Easter;) the *kirk-shot*, *cot-shot*, and last, (though not least, for it was the right of the clergy to exact it,) the *soul-shot*, "a retribution in money for the prayers said in behalf of the dead."

These were willing offerings. The Saxon people were not hard-fisted, nor unworthy of the privileges Heaven had given to them. Ample provision was hence made for the revenues of the clergy, and most of the institutions for that purpose have come down to our own time. The Saxon clergy appear both to have known and taught the pure morality of the Gospel. Their preachers sedulously inculcated that the first of duties was the love of God, and the second the love of our neighbor.

"To subserve this latter object, the aggregate amount of all these perquisites composed in each parish a fund, which was called the patrimony of the minister, and which was devoted to nearly the same purposes as the revenues of the cathedral churches. After two-thirds had been deducted for the support of the clergy and the repairs of the building, the remainder was assigned for the relief of the poor and of strangers. In a country which offered no convenience for the accommodation of travellers, frequent recourse was had to the hospitality of the curate; and in the vicinity of his residence a house was always open for their reception, in which, during three days, they were provided with board and lodging at the expense of the church." (Pp. 58, 66.)

Here no Achæan host graced the festive table with the refinement of habits and suavity of manners, which made Hellas renowned through all antiquity; but the toil-worn traveller found, among the Anglo-Saxons, a race anxious to minister to his comforts, "given to hospitality." The rights of sanctuary, and the peace of the church, were institutions that softened the manners and elevated the generous sentiments of those almost semi-barbarians, to an extent elsewhere unsurpassed in the annals of civilization. "Royal alms" were conveyed to Rome, and the benefactions of Ethelwulf to the pontiff were munificent: nor did he fail to give to the people in the

imperial city likewise. (P. 69.) But unworthy advantage was taken of this liberal spirit, so diffusive among the Anglo-Saxons, by the imposition of the *Rome-scot*, a tax which was originated by Offa, established by Ethelwulf, and continued by Alfred; "and which," in the time of Gregory VII., "amounted to something more than two hundred pounds of Saxon money."* (P. 71.)

Nor did the violent escape the penalty of their neglect:—

"In the laws of Ethelred and Canute, the *grithbryce*, the penalty for violating the peace of a church of the

	Pounds.	Shillings.	Pennies.
1st class was	5	240	1200
2d "	$\frac{1}{2}$	120	600
3d "	$\frac{1}{4}$	60	300
4th "	$\frac{1}{8}$	30	150."

(P. 274.)

The same reverence for the sacred office is displayed in the rates of "the *manbote*," where the bishop comes after the king, thus evincing their recognition of a superiority granted only by Heaven,—and one running through all the variations of Anglo-Saxon social institutions as well as laws.

"In the time of Edward the Confessor, the *manbote* to be paid to the king or *archbishop*, for the murder of one of their retainers, was three marks; to a bishop or earl, forty-eight shillings of five pennies=20 of 12, or half of a mark; and to a thane twenty-four of five pennies, or ten of twelve, or one-fourth of a mark, which was two-thirds of a pound, or one hundred and sixty pennies."†

The clergy were eminently adapted, both by spirit and education, for modifying the rude customs—for forming and mollifying the laws; and their assistance was cheerfully given. How beautifully Christianity moulded their ferocious valor, and made it auxiliary to the life and *spread* of true religion, may be seen from the scanty records of contemporaneous history. It was by their persuasion, that Ethelbert published the first code of Saxon laws; and thus the civil power, in the infancy of its

* Edinburgh Review, January, 1838, pp. 163, 168. The result of "a careful investigation into the progress and success of these clerical encroachments after the conquest," (particularly in regard to *tithes*), is here given.

† Vide also Mackintosh, vol. I., p. 75.

vigor, was much indebted to the superior knowledge of the clergy. It would seem that their authority, too, was consensual; for he who relapsed into idolatry was amenable to the civil power, which punished him "by the forfeiture of his estate and disgrace of the pillory, unless redeemed by the contributions of his friends."

Perhaps the name of St. Columba—hallowed by succeeding ages—will give us no inappropriate idea of the spirit and character of the age; and remind the titled sons of power, how worthless are the applause and favors of worldly wealth, compared with the lustre which lives with him whose life has been dignified by heroic virtue. Columba irradiated the distant isles with the inspiration of a true and fervent Christianity; and "his memory was long cherished with every testimony of veneration by the northern nations." He was the founder of a monastery, far off in the seagirt isle of Iona, the works of which were honorably noticed by Bede, and the influence of which was felt throughout Christendom.

Nor was Columba the only one of royal race, who thus devoted himself to *solitude*, and usefulness, and immortality. Princesses, leaving the homes of their ancestral splendor, eagerly hastened to the cloistered halls of some distant abbey beyond the foaming waves, or, with pious zeal, erected and endowed monasteries in their own domains. Thus, while "crowds resorted to Faremontier, Chelles, and Audeli; Whitby, Coldingham and Ely were soon thronged by those illustrious for *station* and piety." Eauswilde, Mildrede, and Elthelburge, among the Southern Saxons, in Northumbria Hein, Hilda, and numerous others, have been remembered.

"The monasteries were held in the highest estimation: the most distinguished of the Saxon female saints, and many of the most eminent prelates were educated in them; and so edifying was the deportment of the greatest part of these communities, that the breath of slander never presumed to tarnish their character. The monastery of Coldingham alone forms an exception." (P. 83.)

With our ancestors, monastic chastity was venerated.

"To the Saxons, in whom, during the tide of conquest, the opportunity of gratification had strengthened the impulse of the passions, a life of

chastity appeared the most arduous effort of human virtue; they revered its professors as beings of a nature in this respect superior to their own; and learned to esteem a religion which could elevate man so much above the influence of his inclinations. As they became acquainted with the maxims of the Gospel, their veneration for this virtue increased; and whoever compares the dissolute manners of the pagan Saxons with the severe celibacy of the monastic orders, will be astonished at the immense number of male and female recluses who, within a century after the arrival of St. Augustine, had voluntarily embraced a life of perpetual continency." (P. 85.)

Monastic *industry* was equally conspicuous. While their churches were adorned and elegantly furnished, the wild luxuriance of nature was not less subdued "by the unwearied industry of the monks."

"The forests were cleared, the marshes drained, roads opened, bridges erected, and the waste lands reclaimed. Plentiful harvests waved on the coasts of Northumbria, and luxuriant meadows started from the fens of the Gironi. The superior cultivation of several counties in England, is originally owing to the labors of the monks, who at this early period were the parents of agriculture as well as of the arts." (P. 95.)

It is impressive to reflect on the harmony and beauty of the ceremonies attendant upon the consecration of a nun, in Anglo-Saxon Britain—more impressive still to know that they ever regarded their vows, and dispensed a light as cheering and effective as it was pure and illuminating. (Cap. vii. p. 135.)

How comprehensive and simple the injunction to the candidate for holy orders. After all preliminary ceremonies were concluded, the bishop,—

"Having placed the 'stole' across the left shoulder of each, as they successively knelt before him, put in his hand the book of the Gospels, saying, 'Receive this volume of the Gospels; read and understand it; teach it to others, and fulfil it thyself.' Then holding his hands over their heads he thus continued: 'O Lord God Almighty, the giver of honors, distributor of orders, and disposer of functions, look with complacency on these thy servants, whom we humbly ordain to the office of deacons, that they may always minister in thy service. We, though ignorant of their judgment, have examined their lives, as far as we are able. But thou, O Lord, knowest all things; the most hidden things are not concealed from thy eyes. Thou art acquainted with all secrets; thou art the searcher of hearts. But as thou canst ex-

amine their conduct by thy celestial light, so canst thou also purify their souls and grant them the graces necessary for their functions. Send, therefore, on them, O Lord, thy Holy Spirit, that, in the execution of their ministry, they may be strengthened by the seven-fold gift of thy grace. May thy precepts shine in their conduct; may thy people learn to imitate the chastity of their lives; and may their fidelity in their present station raise them to a higher dignity in thy church.' He then completed their ordination by anointing them with oil and chrism, praying, 'that through the merits of Christ, whatever they should bless, might be blessed, and whatever they should hallow, might be hallowed.'" (Cap. vii., p. 139.)

We shall trace other fragments evincing the spirit and *social culture* of those distant days. Such was the Anglo-Saxon Episcopal Synod, which is still appropriately paralleled by the *House of Convocation*. How interesting to the enthusiast, who looks far into the future, must have been the spectacle when the bishops and mitred abbots—venerable by the weight of individual excellence, as well as the sacredness of their official character—gave the first and most *harmonious* specimen of a true legislative body, ere Anglo-Saxon energy had evolved and consolidated such an organization in its political relation. From the church were derived the most valuable impressions of popular equality; it was a pure democracy, realizing itself in, and incorporated with the most useful suggestions for the arrangement of popular assemblies. True, the Wittenagemote was typified in their ordinary "assemblies" before the diffusion of Christianity; but none the less did the church concentrate its fragmentary evolutions, and infuse into them an improved and elevated spirit. (Cap. v. p. 98.) The mutations of society have abolished the *rule* which prevailed in regard to the *dower* of a widow, (for in those simple days, it was the whole of her husband's estate, if they had issue; if not, the half;) but the *form* in use at the matrimonial ceremony, has come down to us since the beginning of the thirteenth century. (Pp. 133-135.)

We annex the following to show how nearly the coronation oath of the Anglo-Saxon kings, corresponds with that now established in England, after the lapse of almost nine hundred years. We shall be surprised to see how carefully the spirit of

that handed down from the records of dim antiquity has been preserved, and almost *imbodied* in the *naïveté* of language by which it is presented.

"The ceremony began with the coronation oath. Its origin may be traced to Anthemius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, whose zeal refused to place the crown on the head of Anastasius, a prince of suspicious orthodoxy, till he had sworn to make no change in the established religion. But the oath of the Anglo-Saxons was more comprehensive: it was a species of compact between the monarch and people, which the bishop, as the representative of Heaven, ratified with his benediction. 'Rectitudo est regis noviter ordinati, et in solium sublevati, hæc tria præcepta populo Christiano sibi subdite præcipere: imprimis ut ecclesia Dei, et omnis populus Christianus veram pacem servent in omni tempore. AMEN. Aliud est, ut rapacitate et omnes iniquitates, omnibus gradibus interdicat. AMEN. Tertium est, ut in omnibus judiciis æquitatem et misericordiam præcipiat, ut per hoc nobis indulgeat misericordiam suam clemens et misericors Deus. AMEN.' A portion of the Gospel was then read; three prayers were recited to implore the blessing of God; and the consecrated oil was poured on the head of the king. While the other prelates anointed him, the archbishop read the prayer: 'O God, the strength of the elect, and the exaltation of the humble, who by the unction of oil didst sanctify thy servant Aaron, and by the same didst prepare priests, kings, and prophets, to rule thy people Israel; sanctify, Almighty God, in like manner, this thy servant, that like them he may be able to govern the people committed to his charge.'

"At the conclusion of the prayer the principal thanes approached, and, in conjunction with the bishops, placed the sceptre in his hand. The archbishop continued: 'Bless, O Lord, this prince, thou who rulest the kingdoms of all kings. AMEN.'

"May he always be subject to thee with fear: may he serve thee: may his reign be peaceful: may he with his chieftains be protected by thy shield: may he be victorious without bloodshed. AMEN.

"May he live magnanimous among the assemblies of the nations: may he be distinguished by the equity of his judgments. AMEN.

"Grant him length of life for years; and may justice arise in his days. AMEN.

"Grant that the nation may be faithful to him; and his nobles may enjoy peace, and love charity. AMEN.

"Be thou his honor, his joy, and his pleasure; his solace in grief, his counsel in difficulty, his consoler in labor. AMEN.

"May he seek advice from thee, and by thee may he learn to hold the reins of empire, that

his life may be a life of happiness, and he may hereafter enjoy eternal bliss. AMEN.*

"The rod was now put into his hands, with a prayer, that the benedictions of the ancient patriarchs, of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, might rest upon him. He was then crowned, and the archbishop said, 'Bless, O Lord, the strength of the king, our prince, and receive the work of his hands. Blessed by thee be his hands with the precious dew of the heavens, and the springs of the low-lying deep; with the fruits brought forth by the sun, and the fruits brought forth by the moon; with the precious things of the aged mountains, and the precious things of the eternal hills; with the fruits of the earth, and the fullness thereof. May the blessing of Him who appeared in the bush rest on the head of the king: may he be blessed in his children, and dip his foot in oil: may the horns of the rhinoceros be his horns; with them may he push the nations to the extremities of the earth. And be He who rideth on the heavens his helper forever.*' Here the people exclaimed thrice, 'Live the king forever. AMEN, AMEN, AMEN.' They were then admitted to kiss him on his throne. The ceremony concluded with this prayer: 'O God, the author of eternity, leader of the heavenly host, and conqueror of all enemies; bless this, thy servant, who humbly bends his head before thee: pour thy grace upon him: preserve him with health and happiness in the service to which he is appointed, and wherever and for whomsoever he shall implore thy assistance, do thou, O God, be present, protect and defend him, through Christ, our Lord. AMEN.†

By those who linger among the shadows of far antiquity—who venerate whatever comes gifted with the spells of mysticism *because* its origin is scarcely perceptible—the East has ever been considered as the land of religious favor; but may it not be equally just to regard it as the soil where (*par eminence*) error has been most incessantly grafted on Christianity; where dim-eyed philosophy has been resorted to, and *adored*, for merging with and *polishing* the doctrines of religion? But the converts among the northern nations were more simple and less inquisitive. "Without suspicion they acquiesced in the doctrines taught by their missionaries, and carefully transmitted them as a sacred deposit to the veneration of their descendants." Two hundred years after Christianity had been planted, the prelates of Cloveshoe made a "confession of their faith," worthy of record by the side of

those in the councils of Nice and Chalcedon. The language is so choice, so elevated, that we transcribe it here:—

"Notum sit paternitati tue, quod sicut primitus a sancta Romana, et apostolica sede, beatissimo papo Gregorio dirigente, exorata est, ita credimus." (An. 800, p. 117.)

The influence of their religion over the civil concerns of society in the aggregate, was not superior to that which it bore in the simple scenes of domestic life.

"Among our ancestors religion was not a dry and lifeless code of morality: she constantly interested herself in the welfare of her children; she took them by the hand at the opening, she conducted them with the care of a parent to the end of life."

In addition to "the three great sacraments" of baptism, the Lord's Supper and penance, they were wont to regard the imposition of hands by the bishop, ordination, marriage and the *extreme unction* with much veneration. It was, indeed, something remarkable to find that the idea of death presented no terror to minds so well cultivated and reposing with such unquestioning earnestness in the triumphs of the Christian faith.

"The directions of St. James were religiously observed; the prayer of faith was read over the dying man, and his body anointed with consecrated oil."

Such was St. Cuthbert's death. The last rites of one to whose zeal and success we have previously alluded, are thus described by Bede:—

"Ecce sacer residens antistes ad altar,
Pocula degustat vitæ, Christique supinum
Sanguine munit iter, vultusque ad sidera et almas
Sustollit gaudens palmas, animamque supernis
Laudibus intentam lætantibus indidit astris."
P. 119.

Nay, more—after their spirits had fled with pardonable zeal, they desired to be entombed in the monasteries *founded by their wealth*, and dignified with their protection.

"Such were the sentiments of Alcuyn, the ealdoman of East Anglia, and one of the founders of Ramsey. Warned by frequent infirmities of his approaching death, he repaired, accom-

* Taken from Deuteronomy, c. xxxiii.

† Lingard, pp. 143-5.

panied by his sons Edwin and Ethelward, to the abbey. The monks were speedily assembled. 'My beloved,' said he, 'you will soon lose your friend and protector. My strength is gone; I am stolen from myself. But I am not afraid to die. When life grows tedious death is welcome.

To-day I shall confess before you the many errors of my life. Think not that I wish you to solicit a prolongation of my existence. My request is that you protect my departure by your prayers, and place your merits in the balance against my defects. When my soul shall have quitted my body, honor your father's corpse with a decent funeral, grant him a constant share in your prayers, and recommend his memory to the charity and gratitude of your successors.' At the conclusion of this address, the aged thane threw himself on the pavement before the altar, and, with a voice interrupted with frequent sighs, publicly confessed the sins of his past years, and earnestly implored the mercies of his Redeemer. The monks were dissolved in tears. As soon as their sensibility permitted them to begin, they chanted over him the seven psalms of penitence, and the prior Germanus read the prayer of absolution. With the assistance of Edwin and Ethelward he arose; and supporting himself against a column, exhorted the brotherhood to a punctual observance of their rule, and forbade his sons, under their father's malediction, to molest them in the possession of the lands which he had bestowed on the abbey. Then, having embraced each monk, and asked his blessing, he returned to his residence in the neighborhood. This was his last visit. Within a few weeks he expired. His body was interred, with proper solemnity, in the church, and his memory was long cherished with gratitude by the monks of Ramsey." P. 152.

These were beautiful and affecting instances of attachment to the departing spirits of their friends; and this incident seems to evince a chaste and cultivated tone of moral sentiment among the Anglo-Saxons. No people ever became illustrious in the annals of the fine arts, or intellectually conspicuous, who failed to *mark* upon their souls this (*not universal*, as has been sometimes maintained) respect for the dead. The polished Greeks retained many of their beautiful solemnities *after* Christianity had taught them that the body was insensible to the fond endearments they lavished upon it; and our Anglo-Saxon forefathers were not less obedient to the voice of nature.

How gratifying to find the frail mementoes of their history confirmatory of this—to connect with it their zeal to become fully versed in all the learning of the age.

"The children of the thanes, educated in the neighboring monasteries, imbibed an early respect, if not a passion for literature. Even the women caught the general enthusiasm: seminaries of learning were established in their convents; they conversed with their absent friends in the language of ancient Rome; and frequently exchanged the labors of the distaff and needle for the more pleasing and more elegant beauties of the Latin poets."

Nor were these efforts attended with slight results; for the whole continent was enriched by the stores of learning that had been collected, and were still clustering in the monasteries of England; particularly in the seminary at *York*, the list of whose works may not prove uninteresting to those who fondly hang over what the friend of Alcuin* reverently terms his "*libros, caras super omnia gazas*"—his guides in a darkened age.

"Illic invenies veterum vestigia patrum
Quidquid habet pro se latio Romanus in orbe;
Græcia vel quidquid transmisit clara latinis;
Hebraicus vel quod populus bibit ore superno;
Africa luciflvo vel quidquid lumine sparsit.
Quod pater Hieronymus, quod sensit Hilarius,
atque
Ambrosius præsul, simul Augustinus, et ipse
Sanctus Athanasius, quod Orosius edit virtus,
Quidquid Gregorius summus docet, et Leo
papa:
Basilius quidquid, Fulgentius atque coruscant.
Cassiodorus item, Chrysostomus atque Joannes.
Quidquid et Athelmus docuit, quid Beda
magister.
Quæ Victorinus scripsere, Boëtius, atque
Historici veteres, Pompeius, Plinius, ipse
Acer Aristoteles, rhetor quoque Tullius ingens:
Quid quoque Sedulius, vel quid canit ipse
Juvenius.
Alcuinus et Clemens, Prosper, Paulinus,
Avator,
Quid Fortunatus vel quid Lactantius edunt,
Quæ Maro Virgilius, Statius, Lucanus, et
auctor
Artis Grammaticæ, vel quid scripsere magistri.
Quid Probus, atque Phocas, Donatus Priscianus
ve
Servius, Enticus, Pompeius, Comminianus,
Invenies alios perplures."

(Chap. x., p. 191.)

Nor shall we fail to admire the taste which formed the following schedule of studies in the same seminary:—

"His dans Grammaticæ rationis graviter artes,

* Aelbert, Archbishop of York.

Illis rhetoricæ infundens refluamina linguæ,
 Istos juridica curavit cote poliri;
 Illos Aonio docuit concinnare cantu,
 Castalida instituens alios resonare cicuta,
 Et juga Parnassi lyricis percurrere plantis.
 Ast alios fecit præfatus nosse magister
 Harmoniam cœli, solis lunæque labores;
 Quinque poli zonas, erantia sidera septem,
 Astrorum leges, ortus simul atque recessus;
 Ærios motus pelagi, terræque tremorem,
 Naturas hominum, pecudum, volucrumque
 ferarum,
 Diversas numeri species, variasque figuras,
 Paschaliq̃ue dedit solemnia certa recursu,
 Maxime scripturæ pandens mysteria sacræ."
 (P. 203.)

The great master-spirits of this age—at once "the types and the expression" of its better features—were St. Aldhelm Alcuin and "the venerable Bede," who, spurning the inglorious *ease* of a monastic life, passed their days in ministering to the mental cravings of their awakened countrymen. They spoke, they wrote, they taught, fervently and cheerfully;* and, having performed the work allotted them, passed away, leaving those who were worthy to succeed them; those who were quickened with the energy of piety and learning, whose souls were attuned to a grateful veneration for the benefactors whose names and virtues they ever loved to cherish. It was the age when Roman arts and Roman mind had just impressed (in the "civil codes") their characters in Western Europe; and the Latin language was the depository of almost everything in science or religion that had escaped the shocks of barbaric invasion. To the Anglo-Saxon scholars, then, the Latin became familiar "as household words;" and, at a time when the wild Franks were but just roused from the sleep of ages by the energy and spirit of Charlemagne, England was irradiated by the beams of a morning whose glory has experienced no dimness, although the tide of a thousand years has changed all else. We mentioned Aelbert. He was preceded by Egbert, in whose praise we have the following effusion of Alcuin, the sweet bard of Anglo-Saxon Britain:—

"O pater, O pastor, vitæ spes maxima nostræ:
 Te sine nos ferimur turbata per æquora mundi,

* As says one of them, "Semper aut discere, aut docere, aut scribere dulce habui."

Te duce deserti variis involvimur undis,
 Incerti qualem mereamur tangere portum.
 Sidera dum lucent, trudit dum nubila ventus,
 Semper honos, nomenque tuum, laudesque
 manebunt."

At the earnest solicitation of Charlemagne, Alcuin left Britain; but that he often pined for "his own loved island-home," that his affections fondly reverted to the land of his childhood, is evinced by the following extract from his letter to the clergy of York, (an extract whose trusting faith and innocent simplicity lend a double charm to the respect we cherish for its author:)

"Ego vester ero sive in vita, sive in morte. Et, forte miserebitur mei Deus, ut cujus infantiam aluistis, ejus senectutem sepeliatis. Et si alius corpori deputabitur locus, tamen animæ, qualemcumque habitaturæ erit per vestras sanctas, Deo denante, intercessionem requies." (P. 209, note.)

This desire was not secured. Far from its shores he sank to rest; and the zephyrs of a more burning clime swept over his lonely, *honored* tomb. Truly does he seem to have been gifted with that far-sweeping, foreseeing vision, which could look beyond his nation's Future—to have been sustained and supported by the unwearied guidance of a Deity ever watchful of his servants. So that Charlemagne not only solicited his services, but his *advice*; became his "own familiar friend;" and this condescension from one who had been the first styled "Emperor of the West,"* and was the champion of the feudal system—at a period, too, when the whole Christian world acquiesced in the doctrine of "the divine right of kings"—was something of a tribute—a tribute to the Christian and the scholar. The following lines will picture forth more than we can express:—

"Mens mea mellifluo, fateor, congaudet amore.
 Doctor amate, tui: volui quapropter in odis,
 O venerande, tuam misis solare, senectam:
 Jam meliora tenes sanctæ vestigia vitæ,
 Donec ætherii venias ad culmina regni,
 Congaudens sanctis, Christo sociatus in ævum,
 Meque tuis precibus, tecum rape, quæso magister
 Ad pia, quæ tendis, miserantis culmina regis."

Charl. apud Al. (*ibid.* p. 210.)

* [A. D. 800.] Hallam, "Middle Ages," Part I. Chap. I., pp. 21, 22.

It was his to give a beautiful and touching example of the reality of religion. To him might the words of Bryant be addressed in all their spirituality ; for he

*"So lived that when his summons came to join
The innumerable caravan that moves
To that mysterious realm where each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of death,
He went not like the quarry slave at night
Scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and
soothed*

*By an unfaltering trust, approached his grave
Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams."*

His last hours were spent in rapt communion with the saints long since departed ; or, more frequently, in reflections on his own approaching death. For this end he often wandered to the spot selected for his resting place, and, great to the last, mused upon the frailty of life. Even after death his works did follow him. His epitaph, inscribed on a brazen tablet fixed in the wall, is characterized by such a pensive beauty and harmonious philosophy, that we cannot be censured for quoting it here :

*"Hic, rogo, pauxillum veniens subsiste viator,
Et mea scrutator pectore dicta tuo.
Ut tua, deque meis, cognoscas fata figuris ;
Vertitur en species, ut mea, sicque tua.
Quod nunc es, fueram, famosus in orbe viator,
Et quod nunc ego sum, tuque futurus eris.
Delicias mundi cassa sectabar amore :
Nunc cinis et pulvis, vermibus atque cibus.
Quapropter potius animam curare memento,
Quam carmen ; quoniam hæc manet, illa perit.
Cur tibi nova paras ? Quam parvo cernis in antro
Me tenet hic requies, sic tua parva fiet.
Cur Tyrio corpus inhiās vestire ostro,
Quod mox esuriens pulvere vermis edet ?
Ut flores pereunt vento veniente minaci,
Sic tua namque caro, gloria tota perit.
Tu mihi redde vicem, lector, rogo carminis hujus,
Et die, da veniam, Christe, tuo famulo.
Obsecro nulla manus violet pia jura sepulchri
Personet angelica donec ab arce tuba.
Qui jaces in tumulo, terræ de pulvere surge,
Magnus adest iudex militibus innumeris.
Alcuin nomen erat sophiam mihi semper amanti
Pro quo funde preces mente legens, titulum."
(Pp. 210, 317.)*

Nor did his successors in England become recreant to their religious faith. When the ferocious Danes overran the country they found the abbots and their monks ready to lay down their lives for the truth, and manfully meeting death,

amid their blazing shrines and the lifeless corpses of their countrymen. Such was the devotion which has given to posterity the name of St. Elphege, and many others, whose pious zeal met no mercy at the hands of the ferocious monsters that cursed the land. This irruption of the Danes (which occurred A. D. 836, and became most oppressive in 876) was a severe blow to those who viewed their religion with reverential awe, who acknowledged its ministers as messengers of the majesty on High, and whose hearts were tuned to the softest strains of penitential sorrow.

The inquiry may here arise, why the Britons did not *merge* with the Danes, as they had before, to some extent, done with the Saxons ? We can only conjecture that, after Christianity had refined their manners, and elevated the tone of sentiment, they could not mingle with their ferocious invaders ; but, abhorrent as their practices were to the Anglo-Saxons, the influence of force might have subdued them were it not that each sovereignty seems to have been endued with a principle of *vitality*—an impulse, elastic as the reality imbodyed in it, of resistance—which the waves of conquest, though they might overwhelm, could never quench. Of this spirit (universal in its expansion) Alfred was the champion—of this tendency he is the most fitting impersonation. It was "the illustrious Alfred" who, in the leisure hours snatched from the cares of a kingdom saved by his energy, found time to translate the works of Boethius, whose own taste, while his arm guided the re-awakened spirit of Anglo-Saxon freedom, purified the decaying sources of Anglo-Saxon literature. Thus, when the Roman arms were no longer seen in Britain, the writings of her illustrious senator were translated and disseminated by Alfred ; and England's once rude barbarians were found to cherish the spirit of freedom when "the seven-hilled city" owned the sway of ferocious tyrants. It was he, who, after consolidating the government, and classifying the varied tribes of his countrymen, founded one of those magnificent universities which have never been surpassed either in talents, piety, or *unchanging devotion to principle*.^{*} Here, doubtless, was the starting

* Hallam, Middle Ages, p. 524.

point of Anglo-Saxon energy, and Anglo-Saxon piety. By his side we place one, who, in the tone of his mind, at least, is analogous: Alfred—Washington; the extreme links (as it were) to a chain of powerful, brave, and high-souled men—the natural offshoots or personifications of an indestructible renovation of social polity which has never maintained its stability among any other people, or flourished for *any length of time* in the vales of any other race, whether Greek or Roman, whether Gothic or Frank. In both there is the same unity of aim, precision of purpose, and indomitable perseverance in laboring for its fulfilment; while their intuitive perception of the most fitting means for every exigency in the accomplishment of their designs, is equally conspicuous. Alfred's throne, however, was wrested from his immediate descendants. Washington's residence, and birth-place, and name are enshrined in the affections of a grateful people. Alfred!—the delight of a darkened age—the father of a revering people—the warrior, statesman, Christian, man—great, sublimely great in all.

But a few hundred years, then, had passed before the subjection of England to the Danes was visibly and successfully accomplished by the elevation of Canute to the throne.* Yet he achieved no secure possession for his successors, year after year was but varied by the attempts of each party to place their own chieftain on the throne; but demonstrated the impotence of Danish force to enslave Anglo-Saxon mind, or annihilate Anglo-Saxon enterprise.

"As the animosity between the Danes and Saxons is to be considered as the real, though often unseen cause of these contests for the throne which appeared to originate in the ambition of individuals, so the final prevalence of the Saxons is to be attributed to their superiority in numbers and civilization, and to their impatience of a barbarous yoke, which is better preserved by the history and remembrance of the more improved people." (Mackintosh.)

From the frosty peaks of Norway swarmed down the bands of pirates who overran Europe, and afterwards peopled the desolate shores of Iceland with arms and arts, with

learning and civilization; who, conquering the nations of the continent, and *reviving* ancient barbarism there, found no quiet rule in English soil, in Saxon character no base subserviency to their brutal exactions and systematic oppression. The results are known. Continental genius, learning and refinement were clouded by the unmitigated barbarism of "the dark ages," while on the shores of Iceland sprang up, and in England glowed, the flame of pure religion and civil progress.* Here was the beginning of those systems, here the birth of those feelings, which seem to have clung to England's soil, and which rejoice us in their more refined and successful developments of the nineteenth century.

But here the meed of praise must cease. Britain, torn by the violence of contending factions, with her soil drenched in the best blood of her kings and people, was a prize too tempting to the ambitious restlessness of William the Norman; and, under the sanction of the "church," (not now the honest, unassuming friend, but the *soi-disant master* of the Anglo-Saxons,) he determined to effect its conquest—a conquest over the spirit, rights and feelings, the whole national existence of the Anglo-Saxons—which, though almost total, it were not altogether judicious to consider an entire annihilation of their civil liberties. From this period the church became more closely allied (and, where it could not reign, more enslaved) to the power of the king; the people less dependent on either; while the nobles were gradually losing their ancient strength, and "the middle class" (now the bulwark of England's greatness) was revived and permitted a share in the councils as well as in the expense of government. In this triple development, although *few* instances typifying the silent progress of that agency, (the power of public opinion,) now so vital and brilliant, were displayed, it was not the less operative, nor the less appreciated. The "tiers état" have been ever since gradually elevating themselves, until the period of our own political origin, when the democratic principle was proclaimed to the world as the natural and inalienable safeguard of human authority, of governmental supremacy.

* A. D. 1016. The struggle between the two races began about 979.

* Mackintosh, vol. I, p. 84.

And the keeping of that precious gem is no easy matter. With mental strength, and incessant devotion, it requires a moral *stamen*, a *substratum*, which history seems to record as peculiar to our own race; for, while the other nations who sprang from the ancient Goths (and more remotely from the Germans described by Tacitus) have suffered their civil liberties to dwindle from age to age, or seen them overturned by the grasping hands of ambitious nobles, and have yielded to the unchecked centralization of usurping pontiffs, (the favorite object which scourged emperors and people during the pontificate of "the monk of Cluny" and his successors;*) while France,† and Austria, and Spain‡ are less free than when under the sway of those early (barbaric) chieftains; the stock planted on British soil has permanently advanced to the full fruition of spiritual and physical liberty. In brief, where the people are less free in these Roman Catholic countries, in England they are far more so than they were some thousand years ago. Thus these branches of the same race, starting from the same point, and from the same places, (not inaptly denominated *officinæ gentium*.) have met with a different fate; for, in one the progress has been towards despotism, exemplifying itself by an absorption of popular influence and the rights of the individual into unbounded ecclesiastical authority or kingly prerogative;§ while, in the other, each successive era has advanced true constitutional freedom, has *developed and emanci-*

pated mind, at the same time that the purest feelings of social life have been welcomed and encouraged. Upon closing this first portion of a few discursive glances at the home of our ancestors previous to the time of William the Conqueror, some sketches of the efforts made by the papal hierarchy to erect here a consolidated empire, subject to the central influence at Rome, may be appropriate in passing over his troubled reign.

The sweep of six hundred years since the Saxons first landed, has disclosed to our view scenes of quiet happiness, of religious purity, and social cultivation, developed by the genius of uncorrupted Christianity, mingled and shaded with tumult, or civil and moral degeneracy. The thorns and roses, fitly blended, met on the branch which bore the hopes of a blissful future. Henceforth, however, Romish influence became the grand agent of unnumbered evils. Introduced and sanctioned by William, whose naturally vigorous mind prevented an indiscriminating subjection to its precepts, it soon overmastered the puny spirits of his successors, soon reigned as the lord over prostrate Britain, where it had been lately known as but the ally of its conqueror.* We speak not unadvisedly when we maintain that there never was a plan more carefully schemed—one, too, almost beyond the reach of human foresight to detect—that met so signal a failure as the efforts of Rome to bend the simple faith, and crush the independent piety of our ancestors.† Some evidence of this might be presented, but it is useless to point out what is traced on each eventful page of England's earlier history. In every other country where Roman arts and the Romish faith have prevailed, it has benumbed the spirit and poisoned the fountains of popular freedom, and secured its throne, even to this day, the brighter day of man's advancement. It is this spiritual energy which has cheered the fainting hopes—which has guided, informed, and embellished the exertions of those, who, from century to century, have striven to *secure* to the masses their natural rights,

* North American Review, Jan. 1845.

† Hallam, p. 105-106, (leg. power of 'les états généraux' lost.)

‡ For a clear view of the predominance attained by the *Castilian cortes* in the interval from the middle of the twelfth to the close of the fourteenth century, we refer to Prescott's *Ferdinand and Isabella*, Introduction, vol. I. pp. 45-58. Their intrepid spirit is traced by Hallam, p. 215, et seq. The *Aragonese cortes*, it seems, enjoyed still greater influence, and more unequivocal privileges, and yet they were nearly contemporary with the *Castilian*. (Commons admitted, A.D. 1133, Hallam, p. 224, in notis.) For its causes see the same learned authors. (Prescott, pp. xcvi.-cv., et seq. Hallam, pp. 218-227.) These have been lost now, and Spain is ever on the eve of convulsion. The power of her cortes is merely nominal, and the government as much enslaved to papal influence as the people are impatient of its yoke.—Am. Rev. (For. Mis.) May, 1846, p. 559.

§ We have not included Denmark in this list; but her history affords an unequivocal testimony to the truth of the position. Vide Dr. Baird's *Visit*, chapters on History of Denmark.

* Mack. Hist. vol. I. p. 87; also 138, 144.

† "The Statutes of Mortmain" (tempore Edw. I.) "were introduced to check the overgrown wealth of the hierarchy." Hallam, p. 301. 2 Kent, pp. 281, 282. The British clergy refused submission to the Church of Rome in 637.

and which is nowhere so successfully displayed as on the soil that nourished "our noble ancestors." Through the reign of the Normans, the Plantagenets, the houses of York and Lancaster, and the first Tudor, (Henry VII.,) this religious independence was not extinct, but slumbering. Rome *had* partly triumphed; and king oppressed noble, the nobles oppressed the people; while a gradual tide of wealth, flowing into the religious houses, corrupted the ecclesiastics and impoverished the kingdom.* But the good providence of God was yet visible; though John had bowed before the legate, and Henry been scourged at Becket's tomb, the people were waking to the echoes of the reformation.†

Such as we have feebly portrayed them, were the aspects of this religion in those early days; and such, or similar, would not be found to mark the experience of any other people. Unrivalled *then* was the Anglo-Saxon race in religious favor; unequalled now in moral excellence, or the means of social culture. Their benevolent efforts have led back the benighted Hindoo to his ancient source of safety, and their labors defied the perils of Africa's clime! On China's hitherto inhospitable shore has *Christianity* sought and effected a lodgment, under the guidance of British statesmanship—a permanent home.

In view of these facts and impressions, we cannot resist the conclusion that Providence has raised up, and sustained, and qualified the Anglo-Saxon race, to perform a great work in reclaiming the world; has guided and protected them from temptation, or brought them from it *purified*, and ennobled by every scene of trial; and has given to them—to *us*—the destinies of the world. That a moral responsibility—a political accountability rest here, whose extent is measured only by the limits of mankind, and for the discharge of which we have not the means alone, but the disposition and ability, seems probable. Some inquiries as to this destiny, and the point we have already attained in its fulfilment, as most beautifully evinced by the

missionary operations of the day, will be presented at the close of this paper. And here—"as in the middle watches of the night"—we leave the church, to note the progress of that enterprising disposition first begun under her promptings, fostered by her instrumentality, and encouraged by her auspices; for, previous to the time of the conquest, the *church* took the *lead* in every movement of social and civil progress, extended her benign influence as an incentive to every noble enterprise; and, when she afterwards refused to attend the triumphant march of free principles and political regeneration, she was left behind. Thus the once servant became the leader, and the church lost all her enormous privileges, while humanity gained all for which it aimed; and Protestantism, with milder beams, irradiated the land once *blessed* by the prevalence of the Catholic (that is, the, then, pure) faith. Many tendencies are at work, now, which mar the purity, and cripple the efficiency of the church. One of these is the augmenting *exclusiveness*, the socialism, so lamentably characteristic of *our* country. This broods over the altars of the Most High; and, until it be destroyed by a spirit of Christian liberality and expansive feeling, the church will never attain the position, the vantage-ground, designed by Providence, for her efficient guidance of the destinies of mankind, or our own.

II. Nor is it their zeal for the welfare of the Siberian, the Negro, or the Indian, their interest in the spiritual welfare alone of these benighted tribes, that commands our wonder. Science, inciting their enterprising disposition, has had its boundaries enlarged, its efficacy renewed by their discoveries. The vast oceans encircling the poles, have first greeted the "cross of St. George," and the accompanying "stars and stripes." England's sturdy sons "a thousand years" had braved the battle and the breeze in those ordinary bays and coasts; but now the stubborn enterprise of her Parrys and Franklins has wrested its laurel from the ceaseless roar of circumpolar waters, ice and snow; and the keels of Europe press on to search those untrodden fields. In the thrilling address of the priest to Boadicea, when "seeking counsel of her country's gods," we notice the prophetic words:

* Edinburgh Review, (before cited,) pp. 163, 168.

† Mack, p. 193. For a perspicacious sketch of their gradually increasing acquisitions the curious reader will find no better guide than Mackintosh.

"Regions Cæsar never knew,
Thy posterity shall sway,
Where his eagles never flew,
None invincible as they ;"

and their rapid fulfilment seems vested with all the *truth* as well as enthusiasm of poetry.

Attracted by these wondrous evidences of a comprehensive policy—one, too, bounded only by creation's limits—other nations have reared the cross on Greenland's dreary shores, and taught her rude children the blessings of religion and civilization; have planted colonies on the farthest limits of our north-western continent, as if a world were too narrow for their venturesome spirit.* In this "labor of love" Europe is not alone. Recently the southern cross has joyfully witnessed the efforts so perseveringly made by American vessels to penetrate those secluded regions, where, since the "morning stars sang together," nought had scanned their boundless diversities of ice and sea, but the eye of their Creator; while on the lonely isles of many a group repose the reliques of our loved, and lost, and honored dead.†

It cannot be denied that much has tarnished the English name where such attempts have been made: witness a Hastings in India, and the progress of the British arms in China. The simple native has been, too often, forced to exclaim, with the ancient Caledonian, *ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem adpellant*. But such results, though frequent, are not a necessary part of the policy to which reference is designed. Nay, each victory seems to have been overruled for the spiritual regeneration of the vanquished:

"For, with the avengers came the word of peace;
With the destroyers came the breath of life."

How different the course of missionary zeal in India, from what is disclosed by the melancholy annals of Cuba, Goa, and the French as well as Spanish West Indies. So far has this toleration of the superstitious faith which flourishes on India's soil been carried by the Company, that the *car*

of *Juggernaut* has been, until very lately, undemolished, and even made a source of revenue to its coffers!

We cannot trace, in detail, the progress of this exploring spirit, nor pause to notice its peaceful triumphs.* Learning has aided such explorations, and been herself improved. With ceaseless rapidity, literature and intelligence are now filling up, where English discovery has paved the way. Knowledge and virtue shout in chorus as civilization welcomes their progress in the North and South, from the East to the late untrodden West. The mental improvement of such a people has been marked by a rapid development and useful *permanency*, which now extort the admiration of their fellows in other parts of the earth. England's soil has numbered a thousand generations, and her people, in all essential particulars, are still the same—invincible, as when a Cæsar vainly strove to crush and curb their spirit or daunt their valor. A thousand years subsequent, they had exchanged their ruder arms for the bow and arrow, introduced by the Normans. "The bow was the emblem of freedom, and the pre-eminence of the *English* archers shows that the political condition of England was superior in the fourteenth century to that of any continental nation.

— "These gallant yeomen,
England's peculiar and appropriate sons,
Known in no other land. Each boasts his hearth
And field as free as the best lord his barony,
Owning subjection to no human vassalage,
Save to the king and law. Hence are they resolute,
Leading the van in every day of battle,
As men who know the blessings they defend.
Hence are they frank and generous in peace,
As men who have their portion in its plenty.
No other kingdom shows such worth and happiness,
Veiled in such low estate."†

Stern and vast, wild and active, are her energies. And thus, as her physical empire has extended over the globe, her mental superiority is attested by her

* That the French are not behindhand in these movements, see *American Review*, June, 1846, p. 667; July, p. 699, *et aliud*.

† *South. Lit. Mess.*, May, 1845, pp. 315, 316.

* The interested inquirer may observe something elucidating this, in *Ed. Rev.*, Jan. 1838, pp. 171, 187, *Am. W. Rev.*, 666, *et ante*; and *South. Lit. Mess.*, July, 1845, p. 420.

† Hallam, pp. 41, 42.

Shakespeares and Miltons; her Newtons and Lockes; by her educated statesmen, her intelligent peasantry.* The action of her press and literary associations, her universities and learned societies, peculiarly ennoble her. To her enterprising disposition, we unite a spirit of freedom at home, which tells us how to benefit ourselves by benefitting others; with her benevolent activity, we combine a reverence for the freedom of religious worship which teaches our people to serve their God and not their "Church."† And these have we received as our dearest, priceless legacy from our venerated forefathers. Palsied be the hand, which, whether in our halls of legislation or elsewhere, would sap the earnest trust of our people in the value of religious influence for the stability of nations!

The efficient feature, then, in modern civilization, is *enterprise*—social, moral, intellectual, and political enterprise; and in this race for distinction, England and America have been first and foremost. It has been said by Guizot, that the prime element in modern *European* civilization is the *energy of individual life, the force of personal existence. In aliis verbis*—"political equality was, and still is, the grand aspiration of the nineteenth century." While discussing the difference in the *spirit* of the ancient and modern government, Lieber says, with much truth, "The safety of the State is their principal problem, the safety of the individual is one of our greatest."‡ In the *mediæval* period it was the standing of man as *bishop, priest, or knight* which gave tone to his consideration in society: the man was lost in his office; but modern civilization (steering a medium course between the tendency, among the ancient Republics, absorptive of the individual in the mass, and the other extreme just defined,) has clearly exemplified the rank, and *elevated* the position of the individual abstracted from the State. While the "tyranny of the majority" has ever been (in this coun-

try) the under-current of this tendency, it is none the less true that the importance of *man, as man*, was first prominently vindicated by the "*resultant force*" of the American Revolution, and that our nation has ever been guided by the principle "that Government has for its mission the full and unequivocal maintenance of the rights of man, of each and every man, in all their plenitude." Has the learned writer reflected how much the English race has been instrumental in evolving the necessary relation of *individual exertions* to the state (*the culture and improvement*) of society; how much they have done to make virtue commensurate with knowledge? Our civilization, be it remembered, is the type and product of our political enterprise—is the mirror of ourselves.

III. There are some important principles which civilization has marked in the very vitals of the English race, as their progress developed its improvement. We are justified in claiming that here the abstract principles of *jurisprudence* are made most practically beneficial, as they are, undoubtedly, best understood. From the age of the Saxon Wittenagemot to the time of William the Conqueror, and from that period to the restoration, (1666,) and the independency of the British House of Commons, (A. D. 1832,) these great foundations of Justice have been scrutinized, which are the bulwark of nations. Hence, "nowhere has the science of the law been carried to such perfection" as in England and America. The rude elements of constitutional freedom, existing during the middle ages, have been exchanged for and moulded with those improvements which time has suggested and experience happily confirmed.

A more extended view as to the manner in which these different discoveries, these evolutions of the great problem of Human Rights, have been effected and incorporated with the frame-work of English society, may be, here, not injudiciously given. In this brief investigation, we shall present some incidents, to aid "in tracing out" the *originals*, the actualizations, "and as it were the elements of the law;" some considerations to assist in "tracing them to their fountains as well as our distance will permit."

* Intelligent, not as they *should* be, but as compared with the mass of the same population in other countries of Europe.

† "The very spirit that impels Anglo-Saxon blood in the wilds of Asia, impels us here in the wilds of America; and all the high characteristics of courage and fortitude, that distinguish the Anglo-Saxon race there, distinguish us here."

‡ Political Ethics.

The history of the middle ages discloses to our view three distinct classes of people, the thanes, ceorls, and villeins; the first of whom received their title from the Danes, and the others were a necessary offspring of the mixture of Saxon and Danish character.

"Under the Saxon government there were, as Sir William Temple speaks, a sort of people in a condition of downright servitude, used and employed in the most servile works, and belonging, both they, their children, and effects, to the lord of the soil, like the rest of the cattle or stock upon it.* These seemed to be those who held what was called the folk-lands, from which they were removable at the lord's pleasure. On the arrival of the Normans here, it seems not improbable that they who were strangers to any other than a feudal state, might give some sparks of enfranchisement to such wretched persons as fell to their share, by admitting them, as well as others, to the oath of fealty, which conferred a right of protection, and raised the tenant to a kind of estate superior to downright slavery, but inferior to every other condition."†

An important concession, this, even of protection!‡ Observe, now, the progress of this enfranchisement in the lapse of a

few centuries subsequent. Speaking of it, Blackstone says, that "these encroachments grew to be so universal, that, when tenure in villenage was virtually abolished by the statute of Charles II., there was hardly a pure villein left in the nation."§ What an advancement in the code of human rights, and from hence what an impulse was given to the progress of true freedom!

There is one memorable instance in the progressive actualizations of this firm adherence to the liberties of mankind when in danger, recorded on the pages of English history: when a proud monarch demanded of the rude and haughty barons at Runnymede by *what title they held their lands*, each stalwart knight clasped his sword, exclaiming, "By this we acquired, and by this we will maintain them;" an impersonation, an evolution of that far-seeing regard for human rights, and individual sovereignty, whose correspondent type is illustrated by the triumph of the English arms at Navarino, when an oppressed people invoked the sympathy of Humanity. The main features of this

"Devotion to the right with their last breath—Resistance of the wrong even unto death,"

have often been displayed to the world during this interval of nearly a thousand years between the two events here specially noted. Who, then, can say that national character will not develop reciprocal phases, after centuries of change, which annihilate everything but the attachment to Freedom, which ages never subdue; or that there is no divine Providence guarding the sacred heritage conferred on one people, and that one, our own race?

* See also Hallam's Middle Ages, (Harper's N. Y. Edit., 1841,) p. 90.

† 2 Blackstone's Comm., (Chitty's N. Y. Edit. 1843) p. 92.

‡ We are not aware that the English operatives are now under any protection; a privilege (it may be remarked in passing) at that rude period conferring valuable advantages. They should remember that the condition of multitudes (Judge Carleton says, that "out of the 36,000,000 who inhabit the three kingdoms, twenty millions, men, women, and children, daily feel the yearnings of unsatisfied appetite." Dem. Rev., Jan. 1844, p. 33. See also Blackwood, May, 1845, pp. 531, 543-548,) of these poor "villeins," [*nomine mutato*,] now in their midst is but little superior to those of whom Judge Carleton speaks, "degraded indeed for a being endued with reason;" and cease taunting us with the barbarism of American Slavery.

§ 2 Black. p. 96. Warren's Law Studies, p. 341.

AN IMPROMPTU.

WRITTEN IN AN ALBUM, WITH THE QUILL OF AN EAGLE KILLED AT NIAGARA FALLS.

BY THE LATE GEORGE H. COLTON.

* THE following verses were an extemporaneous effusion from the pen of the late GEORGE H. COLTON, the Editor and Founder of this Journal. Some two years since, being on a visit in the country, he was asked to write in a young lady's album, and consented, but afterwards forgot his promise, until within an hour of his departure. Being then reminded, he took a pen and wrote the lines as they are given below, while the family were talking and laughing about him. The whole did not occupy him twenty minutes.

The verses, with the above particulars, were sent to the Editor by an elder brother of their author, who was present with him at the time. Though inferior to much else that he wrote, they serve to illustrate his surprising facility, harmony, and correctness of ear and fancy. The vein of melancholy and pathos which appears in these verses—the same which affects the reader in the pathetic passages of his poem of Tecumseh, and in the eloquent and powerful verses to the Night Wind in Autumn, published in the number of this Journal for Nov. 1846—proves them to have been a true effusion of the soul. In the qualities of fullness, power, and harmony of verse, Mr. COLTON had no superior among the poets of our own country. With the spirit and scope of almost every species of verse used by the moderns, he was practically familiar; nor did any appreciate better the peculiar excellencies of our great poets. His taste in this department of letters was at once universal and discriminating. In a Memoir of him that will appear in this Journal as soon as the necessary materials can be collected, a review will be given of his works and character as a poet.—Ed.

Of me—poor minstrel of one struggling hour,
Whose strains shall perish on th' unresting wind—
Thou ask'st, fair girl, some little word, of power
To hold my image in thine absent mind.
Oh! how shall I a flickering art relume?
Ah! why for thee my memory leave its tomb?

For I, upon the sluggish waters cast,
Meseems, have lost the power that thrilled of yore:—
And when from those I love my form hath passed,
Methinks mine image lives with thee no more.
Still, still, oh! still, where'er I wandering go,
Around my steps dark Lethe seems to flow.

Oh, had I but the wing this plume that flung,
Where wild Niagara tears his rocky way,
I would for thee, the cloudy years among,
A lofty and most potent theme essay.
Would that his quill might give the pinioned might
That bears the eagle on his onward flight.

Proud bird!—amid the mountain solitudes
He builds his eyrie, where the storms have birth—
He tears his prey in depths of boundless woods—
And if his gaze grow dim, too near the earth,
Soaring through tempests to the far, calm sky,
Rekindles at the sun his glorious eye.

But I am prisoned in my own sad mind,
With hardly strength to beat the dull close bars;
And thus, by inward heaviness confined,
Forego communion with the earnest stars:
Yet, though my skill be dead, my memory nought,
This prayer hath utterance from my cloistered thought:—

If pain and sorrow and most secret tears
Be e'er withheld from any child of light,
May these be kept from thy unclouded years;
And Time's dark waves no more a wrinkle write
On thy bright face and all unspotted hand,
Than fairy lake upon its silvery sand.

Knowledge is power—yet not for this we pray,
That thy fair mind be filled with deathless lore;
But, that the heavenly and Promethean ray
May light thee safer to the shadowy shore,
And, on the voyage that must eternal be,
Illume thy way o'er that immortal sea.

But most, oh! most, young Peri! we have prayed
Thy life a pure and sinless course may take,
As glides the sweet rill from its parent shade
And runs melodious to the still, deep lake,
Freshening green mead, and banks and flowery sod,
And murmuring softly in the ear of God!

THE NATURAL HISTORY OF PARAGUAY: *

WITH SOME ACCOUNT OF THE JESUITS.

BY E. A. HOPKINS.

WITH the single exception of the discursive narrative of MM. Humboldt and Bonpland, the scientific world is entirely dependent upon the Jesuits for all the information hitherto obtained of this region of the South American Continent, surcharged as it is with every production conducive to the comfort or luxury of mankind. For ourselves, we are convinced that there is no part of the earth where the omniscient providence of God has so bountifully displayed the glorious beauty of his handiwork; for whether we study any of the departments of animated nature, or turn to the woods and forests, teeming with the luxuriant vegetation of the tropics, we find that almost every object has been moulded in some superior form for the higher enjoyment of man—the noblest of His works, and the favorite of His creation.

Before we proceed, however, we must acknowledge our incompetency to do full justice to our topic. Our ambition is bounded by the hope that we may draw the attention of some one, more capable than we are, to the magnificent range of subjects which would so richly reward investigation in this almost unknown region of the world. To the scientific naturalist, or the adventurous traveller, better advice cannot be given than to say, "Go to Paraguay: there you will meet with governmental protection in the prosecution of your labors, and each citizen of the republic will be proud to offer you all hospitality and assistance."

Without being able, therefore, to add anything absolutely new on the Natural

History of Paraguay, we may do some service to the cause, by a condensed compilation from the published, but obsolete, works of some of the Jesuit fathers; occasionally using the advantages which we possess over them, from the more modern and complete forms of classification. But even of the accounts of the Jesuits, we shall be obliged to reject much that is entirely fabulous, and depend upon our own judgment and personal knowledge of the country, for the selection of those statements on which we can rely. For, from an attentive study of the works of those extraordinary men, combined with much information concerning them of a traditionary character, which we collected on the spot, *in propria persona*, we are compelled to adopt the conclusion, that, finding themselves at one time in almost exclusive possession of the richest portion of this continent, they sought to strengthen their influence with the court of Spain, by sending the most glowing accounts of its natural capacities and resources, in order to bring to their aid a larger supply of priests and treasure, and thus enable them to increase the establishments by which they expected to hold undisturbed possession. And when, at last, their schemes were detected, and they were swept from the scene of their labors in a single night, by the jealous government of Charles III., they then, for retro-active effect, published exaggerated details, not only of their own labors, but also of the country which they had been so anxious to retain. We say not this, because we feel the slightest inclination to detract from the wonderful deeds these men accomplished. The fact is too well established that, assisted by the combination of every talent, with every means of education and discipline, they have gone forth to all parts of the world,

* Owing to the absence of the Editor from town, several typographical errors in the article on Paraguay, in the September number, were left uncorrected. The name of the author, Mr. E. A. Hopkins, should also have been inserted.—ED.

and effected far more than any other organized body, whether religious or secular. But it is also an established fact that, astute as they have been and are, the growth of their ambition has been too rapid and monstrous for concealment; and hence they have never succeeded to the full measure of their designs. And now, wherever they go, their enemies far outnumber their friends, and the secrecy and ability of their endeavors are no security against their failure.

The prophetic eye of the great founder of the Jesuits soon turned towards the New World, as the best seat for their future power and stability. For, only nine years after the establishment of the order, their pioneers, accompanying the Portuguese expedition under the command of Don Tomas de Souza, governor of Brazil, landed at the port of Bahia. This occurred in 1549. According to Father Martin Dobrizhoffer, Francis Victoria, of the order of St. Dominic, and first Bishop of Tucuman, "solicitous for the glory of God," called the first Jesuits into Paraguay from Brazil and Peru, in 1581.* This early beginning certainly has the merit of manifesting great ardor in the work before them. The first steps taken to practice upon the credulity of the simple-minded savages were completely successful; and wonderful stories are related of the miracles performed by the cross of St. Thomas, recovered from a lake near Chuquisaca, after an immersion of fifteen centuries! In about fifty years from their first landing, the efforts of these fraudulently pious men had collected thirty establishments of neophytes, containing one hundred thousand inhabitants, and located between the rivers Paraguay and Uruguay, the most delightful region of South America. From this centre, their influence ramified over an immense extent of country. The buildings erected by them were of the most substantial kind, and upon the exact models which they have always used in Europe. Those that were intended to contain their worldly goods were bomb-proof; but the churches were by far the most splendid and elaborate. We have wandered with astonishment over the ruins yet left by the civil wars, which, in our opinion,

their conduct first entailed upon nearly all parts of wretched South America. At San Borja, on the left bank of the Uruguay, we measured the remains of one of these churches, and found it to be one hundred paces long, and sixty wide. Moreover, the sculptured stone and carved wood-work were equal to anything of the kind which we had ever seen. This measurement would make it one of the largest buildings constructed on this continent; and it is said to have been capable of containing thirteen thousand persons. We also visited two of these churches in Paraguay, which are kept in good repair. They are located at Santa Rosa and Santa Maria, and were passed by with contempt by that universal robber, Francia, on account of their poverty. Yet they each contain from thirty to fifty arrobas* of gold and silver. The bells of these churches bear the date of 1599; and not only these, but also a small organ, and all the carved gold and silver, adorned with precious stones, which embellish the various altars and images of the saints, were the product of Paraguayan workmen.

These Jesuits affected to govern all their establishments on the principle of a community of goods. They instructed their Indian "brethren" to the precise extent which rendered them most useful as slaves, and least rebellious as subject-members of their "Christian Republic." But, whilst their "godly preceptors" and "masters in Christ" erected churches and *casas de residencia*, with all the pomp and splendor which wealth could command, the simple-minded architects rested their weary limbs in mud hovels. Whilst the "ghostly comforters" luxuriated on the fat of the land, the Indian workmen tasted not the "milk and honey" which their toil had produced. Whilst the padres taught them to work the farms of the society; to raise sugar, maté,† tobacco, corn, and sweetmeats; to watch the cattle, to tan hides and dye cotton, to make shoes, and manufacture garments; the former alone enjoyed the benefit, and the barefooted, half-clothed neophyte lived on yucca root, and such supply of hope as their corrupt *Christian education* may have left to them.

* Account of the Abipones, vol. I., p. 47.

* A Spanish arroba is twenty-five pounds.

† *Maté* is the admirable tea-plant of Paraguay.

However much our admiration may be excited by the unprecedented exertions of the Jesuits for the benefit and advancement of their own order, we must say that their system was poorly calculated to promote the happiness of the Indian. Such Christian instruction as they gave him, could raise him but little in the scale of humanity. Such Christian example as they exhibited, was as little likely to illustrate the true doctrine of an eternal life; and in seeking to deceive mankind with foolish stories of their *self-denying* and *disinterested* zeal for the conversion of the heathen, they have forfeited the praise which they might have justly earned by their wonderful and successful labors for their own aggrandizement. Now they stand before the world in the light of false prophets—wolves in sheep's clothing—which have deluded and cursed, for so many generations, the fair lands of which they took possession. In proof of our assertion, we shall give the reader some idea of this "Christian Republic," as it is presented in the work of Father Charlevoix, which, on its title-page, states that these establishments of the Jesuits are allowed to have realized the sublime ideas of Fenelon, Sir Thomas More, and Plato!

The Guarani Indians seem to have been more distinguished by the favor of the Jesuits than any other tribe. And the Fathers Joseph Cataldino and Simon Maceratoe, Italians, exacted from the Bishop and Governor of Paraguay, before their departure for the Guarani territory, full power, not only to build and govern as they should see fit, without any dependence upon the Spaniards in whose neighborhood they might settle; but also to oppose, in the king's name, all who should, on any pretence whatever, desire to subject the new Christians to any *personal service*.^{*} From a manifesto of their designs before their departure, we learn that these fathers did not desire to interfere with any advantages which the Spaniards might derive from the Indians in a lawful manner; but that it was the king's intention to prevent their being treated as slaves; besides which, they regarded slavery as utterly forbidden by the law of God. The avowed design was to make them *men*, that

they might be better enabled to make them *Christians*. In the same document we find that the fathers did not think it allowable to make any attempt upon the liberty of the Indians, to which liberty they had an incontestible right. But they wished to make their converts sensible that they rendered their liberty prejudicial to themselves by making a bad use of it; and that they must therefore learn to restrain it within just bounds. Hence the Jesuits only desire them to pay obedience to a prince, who is anxious to become their protector and father; and hope they will submit to his yoke with joy, and bless the day when they became his subjects. All this promised very fairly; but let us see how the promise was fulfilled.

These fathers proceeded forthwith to form two "reductions" for the reception of Indian proselytes, which were peopled so fast that they immediately conceived the design of a "Christian Republic," which might revive the happiest days of primitive Christianity in the heart of this barbarous country.* The first step was to baptize the heathen; the next, to make them swear unlimited obedience to the king. And finally, in 1649, in return for being honored with the title of "His Catholic Majesty's most faithful subjects," they were required to pay an annual capitation tax to the sovereign, of one dollar for each man. This last arrangement was an excellent piece of policy, because it attached the crown of Spain to the interests of the Jesuits, and thus assisted them materially in the prosecution of their plans. After this important point was secure, we soon find out, from Father Charlevoix, that it becomes quite lawful to abridge the liberty to which the Indians so lately had an incontestible right;† that the limited understanding of their neophytes required the Jesuit fathers to enter into all their affairs, and direct them in their temporal as well as in their spiritual concerns; and, furthermore, that the *punishments* consist of *nothing* but prayers, fasting, *confinement*, and *sometimes whipping*, at the sole discretion of their spiritual guides. How rapidly the sublime ideas of Fenelon, Sir Thomas More, and Plato, were now devel-

* Hist. of Paraguay, vol. I, p. 245.

* Hist. of Paraguay, ubi supra., p. 250.

† P. 260.

oped! How affecting the analogous and sympathetic Christianity of the *punishments* by prayer and whipping! Nay, we are informed by Don Antonio Ulloa, in his Voyage to South America, that the liberties of these Indians have been so well preserved, and their minds so well guarded from superstitious fear, by love and veneration for their pastors, that if the latter could be guilty of inflicting an unjust punishment—not a supposable case—the suffering party would impute it to his own demerits, being firmly persuaded that the priests never do anything without a sufficient reason!

In the gradual advancement of this "Christian Republic" to perfection, the next step was to hinder the new Christians from having any intercourse with the Spaniards; not allowing any conversation, and studiously abstaining from teaching them the Spanish language. This, of course, was an excellent precaution. For now the Indians could never come to a proper understanding of their enslaved condition. Nor was it likely they would rebel, or create factions, and so trouble the holy fathers, since no knowledge could reach them but that which the Jesuits thought fit to impart, and nothing could disturb that contentment, under a full sense of their blessings, which was their chief virtue.

Our author, Father Charlevoix, must have slumbered in a most pleasurable forgetfulness of all common sense on the part of his readers, when he put such a mass of contradictions into the shape of a book, as we find in the volume before us. We are told, a little further on,* that the Indians learned in a surprising manner whatever they were directed to acquire; that to hear them read Latin, which was taught them for the service of the churches, one would suppose they understood every word of it; that they copied manuscripts in a very fine hand, which in point of beauty and exactness would do honor to the best copyists of Europe; that their morals could hardly escape corruption, were they to communicate with the Spaniards, but, nevertheless, the orders of Philip V. that they should be taught Spanish, were disregarded, not for this

reason, but because of the great reluctance of these otherwise most dutiful and obedient children, to learn this language, notwithstanding the facility with which they read and wrote the Latin. The next sentence informs us, that these Indians are by nature of a very limited capacity, and understand nothing but what falls immediately under the senses. The next states that they acquired, as it were by instinct, all the arts to which they had access; but then they were directed, says our author, only to such as would exempt them from having recourse to foreign assistance. It was enough to show them a crucifix, a candlestick, a censor, and give them the requisite materials; and thereupon they would make so good an imitation, that it would be difficult to distinguish the copy from the original. They have been known, proceeds the Rev. Father, to make, on bare inspection, the most intricate organs; also astronomical spheres, and Turkey carpets. They engrave upon brass, after giving it a due polish, all the figures traced before them. Furthermore, they have an uncommon taste for music, and perform upon, as well as make, all sorts of musical instruments. So strong, indeed, was their affection for harmonious sounds, that the first Reductions were peopled, according to our author,* by the power of melody, and not by the influence of the Gospel as taught by the Jesuits; thus realizing what fable relates of Amphion and Orpheus. We also discover among these wonderful Indians, who are so stupid and of such limited understanding, gilders, painters, sculptors, artists in gold, silver and other metals, clock-makers, carpenters, joiners, weavers, and founders; in a word, they exercised all the arts *that could be useful to them*—of which usefulness the sapient Jesuits were the self-constituted judges. Our author even boasts, that the churches erected by these Neophytes would not disgrace the largest cities of Spain, either in regard to the beauty of their structure, or the richness and good taste of their sacred vessels and ornaments of every kind.

The churches were "useful," but the houses of the Indians were of small account; therefore they were mean and rude, undoubtedly assisting them to an ever-present

* Ib. pp. 262, 263.

* Ib. p. 264.

sense of that humility which should always characterize the true Christian. For this it was that they had neither window nor chimney, nor seat nor bed, nor more than one apartment. This last, of course, contributed to the cultivation of domestic virtue and female modesty; and the smoke of the fires, which had no issue, and the modicum of daylight, which had no entrance save the door, by marked contrast made them adore the God of Nature, ever present in the spontaneous richness of their highly favored land. Moreover, from a *fatherly* regard for due physical development, the women were made to take abundant "exercise in certain rustic labors not beyond their strength."

These willing and subordinate creatures having been made sufficiently submissive to their spiritual lords, we learn that the next step was to petition the King of Spain to allow them the use of fire-arms. Charlevoix says, that this was to prevent their falling into the most cruel slavery; that there could be no apprehension of anything like a revolt among the Neophytes, for their happiness and security depended upon their loyalty, which nothing but an attempt upon their liberties (?) could impair. Accordingly the new Christians were drilled every week, and rendered competent to fight the battles of the Jesuits, which indeed they did, most faithfully, for many years.

These communities where no quarrels or law-suits were to be seen, where *mine* and *yours* were synonymous, were occasionally visited by the Bishops of Paraguay. These prelates have affirmed, says our author, that their tears of gratitude to God for such manifest favors to the benighted heathen, never dried up during all the time their visitation lasted! To assist in preventing all attempts upon the liberty of the Neophytes, and in consideration of their natural levity and inconstancy, it was thought proper to establish in the Reductions the practice of public penances, upon the same footing which prevailed in the primitive ages of Christianity. Therefore inspectors were appointed to search out all facts capable of giving scandal. Then followed the penitential habit, an obligation of public confession, and a whipping. Of course, through fear of discovery, this operated to make many volunteer a confes-

sion of their crimes. But discretion, says Charlevoix, would not permit this; for the system of espionage could not be deprived of its moral tyranny; it was essential to the enjoyment of the largest liberty! He expressly informs us, that during the act of contrition, which is a portion of the divine mysteries, "they sob and sigh, and would publicly confess their faults, did not the missionaries employ all their authority to prevent it." To hinder all possibility of "scandal," moreover, the new Christians were married to the brides *chosen for them* by the Jesuits. This, too, aided in the cultivation of the domestic affections—the purest and most precious gift of God to man.

This "Christian Republic" is now before our readers, as the facts are furnished by one of its most ardent defenders, himself a prominent member of the mission. Can they say, with the Bishop of Buenos-Aires, when speaking of the company of Jesus in his letter of 1721 to Phillip V.: "How beautiful is a chaste generation, when joined with the lustre of a pure and burning zeal! the memory of such a generation is precious in the sight of God and man?"

But truly we are sick of our subject; nor can we waste our time any longer in comments on the Rev. Father Charlevoix. Were we to follow out his narrative, every page might furnish a proof of contradiction; for his whole work is but a verbose, and not always subtle attempt to conceal the deep-dyed hypocrisy of plans which, under the overshadowing mantle of the pure religion of Christ Jesus, created a tyranny more thorough and more effectual, than that of the Council of Ten, or the Holy Inquisition itself.

The Jesuits had three principles of government. The first was, that they were a body distinct from either the civil or ecclesiastical powers of the community at large. They professed, indeed, allegiance to the king, but allowed neither their institutions, their laws, nor their practical management to be interfered with by him, his deputy, or the bishop. Aided by their perseverance and vast wealth, as well as by their distance from both regal and papal authority, they well nigh succeeded in making Paraguay an empire of their own. Secondly, the complete subordination in which every member of the order lived to his Superior,

at once enabled one overmastering mind to control the whole. The very senses of each individual were subjugated to the volition of the one next removed above him, and the lips dared not to breathe a sigh for independence. This horrid discipline, surely, could accomplish anything short of absolute impossibilities. Lastly, the community of goods and the perfect equality of the Neophytes, was perhaps the most characteristic trait of the Jesuitical form of government. Ridiculous and unnatural as this system, even when fairly administered, is generally allowed to be, how great an imposture as well as fallacy must it not have involved, when it was nothing but a name? For the poor Indian was made to work in all departments for his lords and masters, and received out of the whole produce of the Reductions, only a scanty supply of coarse clothing, coarse food, and a mud hovel. Latterly, it is true, that the Jesuits, in order to stifle the clamor raised against them, gave to each family a small parcel of land, and three days in the week to work it. But what became of the produce? No market was offered to them at home, nor ships with which to transport it abroad. Nor had they any domestic trade, for they could only exchange commodities in kind. The whole product of this extra labor, therefore, went into the hands of the Jesuits, as offerings to the Virgin Mary—"consecrated to our good Mother," says our author, "who will never abandon us in our distress." And thus, through the perfect subjugation of mind and body, which the Jesuits had secured over their Indian proselytes, this apparently liberal allowance of land and time left their condition, for all practical purposes, precisely as it was before.

We must close our relation of these wonderful Reductions with one more reference to Charlevoix. It is his version of their downfall which we would quote, adding thereto the evidence of contemporary writers. Then, after an account of their wealth in the height of their prosperity, we will pass to more agreeable topics.

It seems that the Spanish settlers of this country of Paraguay most unnaturally conceived that their right to the personal service of the Indians they had conquered by force of arms, was quite as good as any that the Jesuits could urge in support of

the power they exercised over those whom they had peaceably subjugated "by the entrails of Christ." To this the Jesuits most reasonably objected. Hence arose dissensions, strife, and all ungodliness, and each party endeavored to supplant the other in the good graces of His Catholic Majesty of Spain. The Jesuits consistently followed out in their representations the hypocritical plan they had adopted from the commencement, and persisted in saying, that they did not hold the new Christians in personal service. The Spaniards, in their turn, beset the court with horrid tales of the cruelty and extravagant versions of the wealth of the fathers; falsehoods about the existence of gold mines were poured into the ears of the avaricious ministers, and no effort was left untried to subvert the now firmly settled missions of the hard-working and guileless Jesuits. Amidst the continued storm of words, the latter seem to have prevailed at court for a considerable length of time. At length, however, a royal visitor was appointed in 1613, to investigate the mutual charges of the hostile parties, and if possible gain such information as might lead to an impartial judgment. The better to fulfill his duties, he proceeded to the seat of dissension. After conferring in private with several persons who best understood the nature of these difficulties, he came to a conclusion hostile to the interests of the Spaniards, and deprived them of the personal service of the Indians for eleven months of the year. But from this decision H. C. Majesty was pleased to subtract another month. He furthermore declared that neither the tribes of the Guaranis nor the Guaycurus should ever be placed under the subjection of serfdom or slavery, upon any pretence whatever; and that the Jesuits alone should be charged with the care of instructing and civilizing them.

We are informed that the visitor had scarce left Ascension, before there arose so furious a storm against the Jesuits, as being the authors of this new regulation, that they were obliged to retire from the city; whereupon the Spaniards began again to treat the Indians with their usual cruelty and injustice. The great distinction between the hostile parties was, that the Spaniards debased the Castilian dignity

in holding the Indians to service by brute force, and without giving them anything but a living in return; whilst the fathers of the Society of Jesus contented themselves with first enslaving the mind, and through this more intellectual and certain method, preserved the services of their bodies, giving them only yucca root to eat, and some flimsy garments to clothe their nakedness. The difference was nothing, so far as it concerned the calculations of rival avarice; but it was great in the *modus operandi*, for one side avowedly worked for themselves, while the other labored professedly for the glory of God and the honor of the Virgin Mary!

This is substantially the view which Charlevoix gives of the matter. The remainder of his work is devoted to a tedious narrative of the constant wars and bloodshed which the rascally Spaniards waged against the meek and unresisting Jesuits; in which the last mentioned were always the injured party, and bore with unflinching resignation the miseries inflicted upon them by the former. But he is careful to avoid all deductions which, by possibility, could criminate his brethren, and really gives us no intelligible account of the reasons which led to their total expulsion by Charles III. He simply ends his work by saying that "the prosperity of these new churches, watered with the sweat and manured with the blood of so many apostolic men," has no further reliance save in the piety of a prince who sent orders from Spain for their extermination. We will, therefore, look elsewhere, and give the testimony of Don Gonzalo de Doblas, who was appointed by the Viceroy Vertiz, in 1781, Governor of Concepcion in the *Misiones*. This writer was upon the spot soon after the expulsion of the Jesuits; but he allowed fourteen years to elapse before he wrote anything upon the subject—a period quite sufficient to have enabled him to gain information of an impartial nature, no longer warped by the bitter animosity of the hostile parties. We are willing to place confidence in his statements upon this ground. We learn then from Doblas, that the Jesuits planted the first seeds of their own ruin in the fundamental principle of their government. Professing an honest allegiance to the crown, they aimed to monopolize all real

authority. The rapid accumulation of their power and wealth alarmed the jealousy of the king, whose mind was constantly inflamed by the sympathetic feelings of his various governors and viceroys in the New World. At last they arrived at the clear conclusion, that if they did not oust the Jesuits, the Jesuits would oust them, and the Christian Republic become entirely independent of the mother country.

The extraordinary council of H. C. M. Charles III. issued a rejoinder to the reply of Pope Clement XIII. to the royal letter, announcing that the Jesuits had been expelled from the Spanish dominions. Therein they are accused of altering the theological doctrines, and of doubting the authenticity of the sacred writings. "In China," it proceeds, "and in Malabar, they have rendered compatible the worship of God and Mammon. In Japan, they have persecuted the very bishops and the other religious orders, in a manner so scandalous, that it can never be blotted from the memory of man; while in Europe, they have been the focus and *point d'appui* of tumults, rebellions, and regicides." "It is proven against them by the undeniable testimony of their own papers, that in Paraguay they took the field, with organized armies, to oppose themselves to the crown; and now, at this very time, have they not been, in Spain, endeavoring to change the whole government, to modify it according to their own pleasure, and to promulgate and put in practice doctrines the most horrible?" Here, then, we have the reliable evidence of a formal document of State, from which the reader can draw his own deductions.

The manner of their expulsion was not less secret and conclusive, than the determination which led to it. On the 27th of February, 1767, Charles III. issued a royal decree, banishing the Jesuits from all his dominions. Shortly after this, the prime minister, Count de Aranda, sent peremptory orders to Bucareli, Viceroy of Buenos-Aires, to take immediate and active measures for simultaneously seizing them in their strongholds, and shipping them to Europe.* Bucareli received this order

* Robertson's *Four Years in Paraguay*, vol. II. pp. 62, 63, et seq. The Messrs. Robertson profess to have gained much of this information from unpublished Spanish manuscripts, in possession of Sir Woodbine Parish.

on the seventh of June in the same year, and, from the facilities in his power, found that he could fix upon the 22d of July following, as the day on which all the Jesuits should be instantaneously *eradicated*. At midnight, therefore, of the 22d of July, 1767, they were swept from their homes and possessions to a man. None escaped. They were marched to Buenos-Aires, from whence, as Bucareli expresses it, they were *remitted in parcels* to the amount of five hundred, as a present to Pope Clement XIII. His Papal Majesty was much incensed at the impertinent presumption of his vassal, the powerful monarch of Spain and the Indies, and refused to grant his "holy and apostolic" benediction upon this measure. His successor, Pope Clement XIV., more pliant to the wishes of the king, ratified, in 1773, the proceedings against the Jesuits; and issued a complete brief—not *very brief*—consisting of forty-one articles, which we have not seen. Therein we are told that he exonerated King Charles from all blame, and in direct terms made many and weighty charges against the down-stricken Jesuitical order.

Such was the disastrous end of this "Christian Republic." Its foundations so firm—its superstructure so grand, which, for the space of one hundred and eighty-six years, had excited the envy and the wonder of mankind—in a single day were seen no more. Alas, for the Jesuits! Their goods and chattels—their dwellings and churches—their land and cattle—their silver and gold—their tools and workshops—their subjects and slaves, were all lost to them, and added to the crown of their jealous sovereign. With all their wisdom, caution, calculation, strength, wealth, learning, and double-dealing, the Jesuits were out-jesuited at last; and at the moment when each individual was aspiring to advancement, and every one thought his house built upon a rock, the followers of Loyola found, to their cost, that the Count de Aranda and Bucareli were stronger than they. From that day to this, they have not sought an open return to these countries. Though many, undoubtedly, exist in South America, none are to be found in Paraguay.

In the height of their power, we learn, from a dispatch of Bucareli, that "five hundred Jesuits were distributed over a

distance of more than 2,100 miles; that they possessed twelve colleges; more than fifty estancias and settlements, made up of a vast number of servants and slaves; thirty towns or Reductions of Guarani Indians, inhabited by one hundred thousand souls; and twelve thousand Abipones, Macobies, Lules, and various other nations of Chiquitos; not to speak of many more, of whom, through the Jesuitical principle of keeping the Indians from all intercourse with the Spaniards, we know nothing." Furthermore, speaking of these possessions he says, "Empire it may truly be called; because, counting Indians, slaves, and other servants, they have in this vast country more vassals than the king."

We copy from Robertson a condensed statement of the value of the missionary establishment of San Ignacio Mini:—

3,500 Indians, valued at . . .	\$700,000
5,000 head of horned cattle, . . .	10,000
1,600 horses,	1,600
2,000 mares,	1,000
700 mules,	1,400
500 asses,	500
5,000 sheep,	2,500
Church and casa de residencia, . . .	100,000
Territory twelve miles square, . . .	3,200
Church ornaments and plate, . . .	120,000

Total, \$940,000

On the day of the expulsion we find the number of cattle in the thirty missions was as follows:—*

Tame cattle,	743,608
Oxen,	44,114
Horses,	31,603
Mares,	64,352
Colts,	3,256
Mules,	12,705
Asses,	7,469
Sheep,	225,486

This aggregate list of cattle, when compared with the corresponding list in the mission of San Ignacio Mini, shows a proportion of thirty to one. If we take this rule for our guide, we shall find the whole wealth of the thirty missions to have amounted to twenty-eight millions two

* "Memoria sobre las Misiones." Don Pedro de Angelis. Buenos-Aires, 1836.

hundred and six thousand dollars. And if we estimate this according to the usual standard of difference between the value of money in that day and in our own, the result will be found to exceed by far one hundred millions of dollars at the present time. But the combination of priestly influence and political power ruined them, as we have seen already. "So long as they confined themselves," says Robertson, "to the care of their flocks, and whilst their political situation was feeble or precarious, they went on and prospered; but when they had made those flocks subservient to their aggrandizement, and from year to year, by papal bulls and royal concessions, had isolated and withdrawn themselves from under the control at once of diocesans, viceroys and governors, they got into a false position, and paved the way for their own downfall."

But enough of this. It is time that we proceed to the other topic intended for our present communication. The work of Father Martin Dobrizhoffer is on the whole the best guide to what is known of the Natural History of Paraguay proper; but this we shall occasionally improve, as well by our own recollection of what we saw there, as by the accounts of other writers upon the contiguous countries of a much more recent date. For the upper regions of the river Amazon and the rivers Paraná and Paraguay, as far as any knowledge of them has reached us, are very similar in their spontaneous productions, though not in their geological conformation. We shall commence with the principal quadrupeds.

The ANTA, or LA GRAN BESTIA, (*the great beast*.) from its superior size, as well as its dissimilarity to all known animals, claims our first attention. As far as it bears any resemblance to other quadrupeds, it may be likened to the Rhinoceros. It has the same extremely thick hide, the same long upper lip, with which to collect the same food, viz., the grass and herbage, and it is naturally of a mild and gentle disposition. Here, however, the similarity must end: in all else it is *sui generis*. Dobrizhoffer's description is the best we have read, and corresponds with a specimen it was our fortune to see in Paraguay. Its size is about the same with that of a full-grown ass; in shape, if we except its eyes, head,

and feet, it resembles the swine; its teeth are sharp and regular, like those in the lower jaw of a calf, save only that it has four tusks in each jaw, similar to those of a wild boar. When enraged, the upper lip is projected to an extent which reminds one of a proboscis. A smooth, short and bare appendage supplies the place of a tail. The stomach contains a pouch, in which are often found a number of polygonous bezoar stones. To these the natives ascribe extraordinary medicinal virtues, either altogether imaginary, or, at least, greatly exaggerated beyond their real value.

There is no animal of our continent which seems to be so little known as this, and about which so many contradictions exist, even in the histories of the most celebrated naturalists. In the "Naturalist's Library," edited by Mr. A. A. Gould, A.M., and which professes to use as authority the works of Cuvier, Griffith, Richardson, Geoffroy, Lacepede, Buffon, Goldsmith, Shaw, Montague, and others, we find it stated that the Anta has three toes upon the anterior feet, and four upon the posterior. Goldsmith himself, on the other hand, says it has four claws upon each foot. In a work by Mr. Bennet, entitled "The Garden and Menagerie of the Zoological Society Delineated," it is said to have four toes upon the anterior and three upon the posterior feet. Father Dobrizhoffer, however, who spent twenty-two years in Paraguay, asserts that its fore-feet are cloven into two hollow nails, and the hind-feet into three; and this agrees best with the specimen which we saw during our own brief residence.

The inaccurate historian of "Animated Nature" also ascribes to this animal small, long and pendent ears, and a fondness for the water which almost makes it amphibious. But both these statements are erroneous; for it has rather short, straight ears, inclining forwards, and only takes to the water when pursued. Its favorite haunts are the deepest recesses of the most rugged forests, almost inaccessible to both stags and horses, where it sleeps by day and feeds by night. The Anta belongs to the Pachydermatous tribe, so called on account of the extreme thickness of the skin, and farther characterized by the toes being entirely enveloped in in-

flexible hoofs, and by the want of ruminating stomachs. The name under which it is usually described by naturalists is that of the *Tapir*, but the appellation which we have given is the one used in South America. There are only two species yet known, one of which was lately discovered by M. Roulin. In color it is a very deep brown, and it sometimes has a stripe of black on both sides of the shoulder, like a mule. The mane is about six inches long in the adult, and is stiff like the bristles of the hog. It is covered with hair, but so thin and close that it is hardly distinguishable at a short distance. Its strength exceeds that of any known animal of its size, but it is harmless and inoffensive until attacked. It produces but one young one at a birth.

Mr. Bennet represents the Anta as ranging from the Isthmus of Darien to the Straits of Magellan. In this, however, we think he must be mistaken, for it is not found on the extensive plains or *pampas* to the southward of Paraguay and Tucuman.

The plains of Paraguay, as well as those of Buenos-Aires, contain immense numbers of OXEN, HORSES, and MULES. Even now, after forty years of continual war in the latter province, many persons possess herds containing thousands of them. The oxen are larger than ours, equal in height, but surpassing them in girth. The trade in hides, if ever opened to the world, must prove very profitable. They average now, according to size, from twenty-five to fifty cents apiece. Ox-hides are employed by the Paraguayans in making ropes, building fences and houses, making casks for the tea of Paraguay, (or *yerba maté*,) tobacco, sugar, flour, and many other things. We can recommend the *hide hammock*, most curiously made of the thinnest strips of raw-hide, as the most luxurious bed for a hot climate in the known world. HORSES are valued according to their color, but more particularly according to their paces. Though, of course, not equal to our thorough-bred horses, we should say the breed of horses in Paraguay was far superior to the average of our own. The story of the historian Robertson, that the horses of America have small bodies and no spirit, and that they are mere dwarfs and spectres in comparison with those of

Europe, is long since exploded. Horses are deemed fit for labor in Paraguay at thirty-five years of age; for, owing to the great number of them, they are never injured nor their lives shortened by hard work as with us. It is considered a disgrace to use a mare, or to cut your horse's tail. In these respects civilization might learn a little decency and humanity from the South Americans.

The MULES are larger than any that we know of, and of equal endurance. They are at present of more value than horses, and the time has been when Paraguay annually sent eighty thousand of them into Peru, where they were sold for from ten to fourteen dollars apiece.

A sufficient number of the FELINÆ are found in this region, but happily they are all of such a diminutive size, when compared with their more ferocious brethren of Asia and Africa, as to be little dangerous to man. The PUMA, or SOUTH AMERICAN LION, is found but seldom in Paraguay, though it is known to be an inhabitant of all parts of the continent, south of Canada. It is probably attracted to the pampas of Buenos-Aires by the greater number of cattle there. The BLACK PUMA, (*Felis nigra*, Griff.) is very ferocious, but scarce in Paraguay. Its skin is very valuable on account of its beautiful black color. It is about two feet ten inches long, excluding the tail, which is about thirteen inches more. The YAQUARUNDI of Azara is a native here also, and is found more frequently than any other of the Felinæ. It is an inhabitant of the deep recesses of the forest, and climbs trees to prey upon birds and monkeys, never attacking the larger quadrupeds unless when pressed by hunger. Its color is a deep gray, which is produced by each hair being ringed alternately by black and white. It is seldom seen more than four feet in length, including the tail. The EYRA of Azara is of a reddish brown, the length of the body being about twenty inches, and that of the tail eleven inches. It much resembles a little Puma.

The JAGUAR, or AMERICAN PANTHER, next to the Tiger, is one of the strongest and most powerful of the Felinæ. In the spotted markings of its skin it rivals in beauty those of the species inhabiting the old world, and apparently fills the same

station in animal life. Two or three species of this animal are supposed to exist in Paraguay, the distinction being founded on the different markings of the skin. But if we adopt the classification of Cuvier, we may confidently assert that there are four species there of equal size and strength. These animals have been known to climb the smooth trunk of a tree forty or fifty feet in height, without branches. They are, when full-grown, seven feet long, the height at the shoulders being two feet two inches. The Jaguar commits great havoc among the herds of horses, and the swiftness of the courser is unavailing before one of these relentless foes. Oxen, sheep, mules, and asses, also form their favorite prey, and the depredations committed are sometimes very extensive. Humboldt says that their numbers are so prodigious that four thousand were killed yearly in the Spanish colonies, and two thousand skins exported annually from Buenos-Aires. They are taken by the lasso and the balls, (*las bolas*.) The latter weapon is one not commonly known. It is composed of three leather thongs, the end of each containing a round stone, bound in leather. One of these stones is smaller than the other two, and is intended to be held in the hand whilst swinging the weapon for its flight. A rotary motion is given to it, until each thong presents an extended appearance like a pole. Then, being thrown with great violence against the object of attack, it entwines itself around the legs of the victim, closing with such force as often to break them, but seldom failing to entangle the animal to such a degree as to preclude all possibility of escape. We have often seen both the lasso and the balls thrown at the distance of forty yards, with unerring accuracy. This animal, like many of his kind in South America, is in no wise particular about the selection of his food. We are informed by Humboldt that monkeys, turtles, fish, and eggs, are included by his omnivorous appetite. The turtles are as expertly taken from out their shell by his claws, as if it had been done by the art of man. He is also a successful fisher, and an excellent swimmer. In this recreation, the animal spouts white froth from its mouth, which, floating on the surface of the stream, is eagerly sought for by the hungry fishes,

and they are as eagerly tossed to the shore by his claws. The exceeding beauty and usefulness of the skin causes these animals to be sought after with great success, and their numbers have decreased greatly in consequence.

The OUZA, the *Felis uncia* of Linnæus, is a species of the Felinæ but little known, and is a native of Paraguay. In the same category we are compelled to place the CHATE, or *Felis mitis* of Cuvier. They are both smaller than the Jaguar, but equally graceful and beautiful, possessing all the general characteristics of the diurnal cats.

The OCELOTS, considered as forming a subordinate group in the great family of the Felinæ, are of the middle size between the larger and smaller cats, and are of more slender and elegant proportions. They all belong to the New World, and number four varieties, all of which are found in Paraguay. They are the OCELOT, or *Felis pardalis*, LINKED OCELOT, or *Felis Catenata*, the LONG-TAILED OCELOT, or *Felis macrourus*, and the MARGAY, or *Felis tigrina*.

Of animals of the SHEEP and GOAT kind, Paraguay possesses her full variety. We regret, however, that we are unable to classify some of them according to any received system. For oftentimes it is impossible to tell, from our slight knowledge of them, whether they belong to the Sheep, Goat, or Deer kind, since they possess some characteristics nearly resembling all of these, while, in other respects, they are seemingly utterly distinct. Hence it is impossible to determine with precision to which class they belong. The tame sheep and goats differ in no respect from those known so well among ourselves, save that the former produce a much coarser kind of wool, which has become an important article of export from many parts of South America to this country. Of this wool our manufacturers make blankets, carpets, and other articles. We have no data concerning the introduction of the parent stock of these sheep, but must naturally presume that they have descended from the Spanish merino, which is so celebrated for its fine wool. We suppose, therefore, that either from a want of care in the breeding, or the difference of climate, or both, the fleece has thus deteriorated. Great quantities of this

wool can be had in Paraguay for two cents per pound; but now, detained within its own country by the tyranny of Gen. Rosas, there is no demand for it, and consequently no encouragement for its production.

We are inclined to differ somewhat from all authors who have written upon those varieties of the Sheep called Peruvian. Some able papers recently appeared in the "American Agriculturist" upon the *Alpaca*, embodying more or less all the information of this genus hitherto obtained by naturalists. The author of these papers is "led to believe that there are at least three kinds of Peruvian Sheep, namely, the GUANACO, or *Llama*, the *Paco*, or *Alpaca*, and the *Vicuña*; which agrees with the classification of Baron Cuvier, who regards the *Alpaca* as a mere variety of the *Llama*, and who considers the *Vicuña* as the only animal of the group that deserves to be specially distinguished from the latter." Though these animals, strictly speaking, are natives of the more immediate regions of the Andes, yet they have been known in Paraguay since its earliest settlement. But two other species must be added to them, viz., the *MACOMORO* and *TARUGA*, which, though apparently belonging to the same family, do not seem as yet to have been noticed by naturalists. Though, doubtless, Baron Cuvier satisfied himself that the *Vicuña*, *Alpaca*, and *Llama* were but varieties of the same species, we are inclined to think that he was influenced in this decision by the fact, that the natives applied the name of *Llama*, or *Sheep*, to them all, as well as by the further circumstance that all these animals produce hybrids, which of course must introduce a large number of intermediate varieties. So, among ourselves, we have many kinds of sheep, of which the original stock, at this day, is utterly undistinguishable. But we know that sheep have been found alike in the African desert, and on the plains of Siberia, in Iceland, and in Persia, which, though in one sense varieties of the same species, in another were independent species, having alike an independent origin. Such we take to be the case with those of Peru, and consequently we may enumerate six different species, the *HUANACHO*, *LLAMA*, *VICUÑA*, *PACO*, *MACOMORO*, and *TARUGA*.

It is to be observed here, that *Paco* is the native name which both Linneus and Cuvier have taken the liberty to alter into *Alpaca*. These animals are known to be of a larger size upon the hilly parts of Paraguay, than upon the Andes. This fact should be interesting to our agriculturists, as we are aware that endeavors are now making to introduce them into our country. The hybrid race does not procreate, but is a far more beautiful animal than either parent, and produces a finer and heavier fleece. Experiments hitherto, however, have not demonstrated the benefit of breeding them, as they have lived in northern latitudes but a short time. The most certain return is to be found in the wool of the *Vicuña*, because the fleece is the finest and heaviest of any species of the sheep. The garments produced from it bear a silky appearance, and excel all others of the known world in beauty, comfort, and durability.

Among the ruminating animals of Paraguay, the *DEER* family deserve an important place. The *GUAZAPITA*, *GUAZUPUCO* *DEER*, and the *GUAZUTI* *DEER*, are the three only species with which naturalists are as yet acquainted. They were first classified by Azara, since which time no further discoveries have been made concerning them. The *Guazuti* *Deer* group contains several other species, which are still in such obscurity as to render it uncertain whether they will rank as different animals, or only as varieties or different states of the same, according to the influence of the season or the color of their hair. The *Subulo* is another variety of the *Deer* family. Another species mentioned by Azara, and entering into this division, is the *GUAZU-BIRA*, the *Bira-roe* of Major Smith, and the *cerous nemoricagus* of Lichtenstein. These *Deer* are exceedingly fleet, and do not yield the palm of beauty to any known species or variety in the world. They are very plentiful in all parts of Paraguay.

Four different species of *WILD BOARS* abound in the woods of this country, two of which contain upon the back a spongy glandular protuberance, filled with a white liquid like milk, and scented like musk. These are the *COLLARED* and *WHITE-LIPPED* *PECCARY*, two distinct species. It does not appear for what purpose this liquid is

thus secreted. It is exceedingly offensive to most persons, and it is necessary to cut off the flesh containing it, immediately after death, to prevent the contamination of the remainder of the carcass. D'Azara, however, had an unaccountable partiality for it, and rates Buffon for calling its odor unsavory. We cannot agree with him. Of the peculiarities of the two other species we are ignorant. The Peccary is found in great numbers, and is esteemed good eating.

FOXES of three varieties are found in Paraguay, which do not differ materially in their color from our red, gray, and black species; and, what is more extraordinary still, they manifest a strong partiality for "good fat capon!" Among the *blessings* of this country of Paraguay, may also be enumerated one which is common to all parts of this continent, viz., a plentiful supply of the weasel kind, in the most foetid of their representatives, the SKUNK! Dobrizhoffer says, this animal is called Zorino by the Spaniards. He was so unfortunate as to experience, in his own person, the operation of its powers; and came to the conclusion that if Theophrastus, Paracelsus, and all the other chemists, had conspired together, with all their furnaces and skill in alchemy, they never could have composed a smell more intolerable than that which the Skunk exhales by nature. Spirit of hartshorn, or any more powerful odor, if there be such, might be called aromatic scents, frankincense, balm of Gilead, yea, the most fragrant roses and carnations, by him that has once smelt the Skunk! We are much amazed at the assertion of Goldsmith, that many planters among the Americans keep this animal tamed about their premises. Such an evident absurdity hardly needs contradiction. We may next mention the BISCACHA, which appears to be a kind of *Ferret*. They are extremely numerous, feeding upon rabbits, which overrun the whole country, and comprise some fifty varieties, of different color and markings.

We can safely say that to investigate the different species and varieties of the MONKEY TRIBE, which exist in South America, would require, in the present state of the country, the period of many lives, if not the lives themselves. The sub-family *Platyrrhini* of *Geoffroy*, con-

tains already eight different species, comprising sixty-five varieties, all of which belong to tropical South America. These fill the woods with their discordant chattering, until the unfortunate traveller, if he unluckily possesses an ear for harmony, becomes distracted with the noise. Only the northern part of Paraguay is afflicted with these pests, and this portion also fares less hardly than nearly all parts of Brazil. Many varieties of these monkeys are found within small ranges of three or four degrees of latitude, and seem to be restrained within bounds by rivers of any magnitude. In the thickly inhabited districts, we know of only three or four of the more harmless kinds.

But there is one species which deserves especial mention, called DIABLOS DEL MONTE, or *devils of the mountain*, and may be considered as the Ourang-outang of America. They are very hairy, and in walking, preserve the upright posture. Their footsteps are like those of a boy fourteen years old. They possess strength sufficient when attacked to tear a man in pieces, and should one be espied by them in the woods, he is sure to be compelled to stand on his defence. Moreover, they have the power of uttering a sound imitating the human voice in distress. Fortunately this monster inhabits only the deepest recesses of the forest, and is seen but seldom. One species of the SLOTH, called AY, is frequent here. It has a tail, and three claws upon each foot, which are bent backwards: its appearance is ridiculous and disagreeable in every point of view.

Of the few Rodent animals that attain to any size in Paraguay, we may mention the PACAS, and several varieties of the AGOUTIS. These animals are most highly esteemed for the table, and might be usefully introduced into our rabbit warrens. COATIS also, of several species, are found here: the most common is the *Nasua Narica*, (F. Cuv.) or BROWN COATI. Naturalists mention but one species of squirrel as inhabiting this country, which M. Buffon calls the *Coquakin*. It is remarkable for the grace of its movements, and the beauty of its colors. It has, however, many companions of different varieties which are not yet described.

The ARMADILLO, or TATU, is found in great numbers in all the pampas of South

America. We have frequently caught them, and our next meal was always relished as a feast. Another singular creature is the TAMANDUA, or ANT-EATER, which destroys countless millions of his favorite prey. But this animal is fastidious in his tastes, and confines himself to the ants and eggs of a particular species, known among the Guaranis by the name of CUPIS. A small fissure serves him for a mouth, from whence he protrudes a tongue of twenty-five inches in length, and more slender than a goose-quill. He dips this tongue, coated with a strong glutinous substance, into an ant-hill, and when covered with his prey, he draws it back into his mouth, and swallows them instantly. But the strangest peculiarity of this animal, consists in the singular mode and the great rapidity by which he ejects from his mouth whatever particles of dirt may have adhered to his tongue, reserving only the ants for food.

The catalogue of amphibious animals in Paraguay is very extensive, and many belonging to it are entirely unknown to the writers of Natural History. Among the more familiar are ALLIGATORS, or CAYMANS, of two kinds, the red and the black; also, the CAPIBARA, or WATER-HOG; OTTERS in great abundance; SEALS; IQUANOS, LIZARDS, besides frogs and toads of numerous varieties and variously developed musical talents. Then we have, in the language of the natives, the AGUARA, or WATER-DOGS; YAGUARO, or WATER-TIGERS; and RIVER-WOLVES, to which we add the Aô. The name of this dreadful beast signifies clothing in the Guaraní language, for the Guaranis formerly wove garments from its wool. It resembles the mastiff in size, possesses singular ferocity, and equal swiftness, but no tail. Nor does it hesitate to attack man wherever he is encountered. Fortunately this beast is very scarce, and of late years has been rarely seen. The *Water-dogs* have the ears of an ass, with the head of a dog, and are of a timid and cowardly disposition, fleeing from mankind with instinctive dread. They roar with a loud voice at night, and are valued only for their extremely soft fur. The *Water-tiger* is larger than the latter, and commits great depredations upon horses and cattle, by seizing and speedily disembowelling them as they are swimming across the riv-

ers. The *River-wolves* include two varieties, a larger and a smaller. They are valuable only for their fur. The *Seals* are scarce, and probably have found their way up the river Paraná from the mouth of the La Plata, where they are taken in great numbers.

Among some one of these unknown animals, we would be inclined to place, if we could, the MANATI. But this extraordinary creature stands alone. It is shaped somewhat like a seal in the head and body, having short and webbed fore-feet, or hands, but armed with four claws only. Its hinder parts are precisely those of a fish, and it wants even the vestiges of the bones which form the legs and feet in other amphibious animals. The largest of these are about twenty-six feet in length. The female brings forth but one at a time, and her breasts are placed like those of a woman. They have no teeth, nor voice, nor cry. Their internal conformation resembles very closely that of the horse, and they are entirely herbivorous. The fat of this animal has a fine smell and taste, and is much esteemed as an article of food. It is chiefly found in the large rivers of South America, often two thousand miles from the ocean; and may possibly be identical with the COW-FISH mentioned by Edwards, in the Voyage up the Amazon.

Having imperfectly accomplished this part of our work, let us betake ourselves to the more attractive and extensive, but still more unexplored department of Ornithology. As our design is simply to draw attention to that portion of the world which our subject comprises, in so far as we are able to delineate its surpassing beauty and spontaneous wealth, we must be excused for reiterating the assurance that we make no pretension to indite a scientific paper. We have already said that we shall be amply repaid if we succeed in displaying but a small portion of the exuberance which awaits the zeal of the natural philosopher in that glorious region. As far as seemed proper in our casual mention of the different animals already alluded to, we have hitherto, however, followed the comprehensive and simple classification of Goldsmith, as taken from Linnæus and Buffon, and this we shall continue to do in our enumeration of the BIRDS OF PARAGUAY.

The NANDU, or American Ostrich, is found in great numbers in the pampas of South America. It is the largest bird in the world, with the single exception of its prototype of the African continent. It closely resembles the Ostrich, but its plumage is less exuberant and valuable, and it has one toe less, leaving but two on each foot.

The RAPACIOUS KIND is well represented in this region of country by the CONDOR VULTURE, (rare;) the BEARDED-VULTURE; the BRAZILIAN VULTURE; and the KING VULTURE; the BALD EAGLE; CARACARA EAGLE; VULTURINE CARACARA EAGLE; TURKEY BUZZARD; COMMON OF WANDERING FALCON; KITE, *Falco Mississippiensis* of Wilson; WHITE-TAILED HAWK, *F. dispar* Temm.; SWALLOW-TAILED HAWK, *F. furcatus*, Audubon; HEN-HARRIER, *F. uliginosus*, Wilson; and the BURROWING, GREAT-HORNED, LONG-EARED, SHORT-EARED, and WHITE or BARN OWLS. These birds, with the exception of the Owls, are of the greatest use in these countries. Otherwise, from the immense number of oxen that are annually killed, the atmosphere would become tainted by the carrion on the earth. From the luxurious repasts ever ready for them, they are found in vast numbers, and are so easily approached, that we have frequently shot specimens of them with our holster pistols. We may add that great quantities of crows and hawks of many varieties are found in Paraguay, which we are unable to name or classify. One variety of the former is apparently in close affinity to the vulture, being quite black and having no feathers on the head or neck. When feeding upon a carcass they seize the intestines and carry them through the air like a long rope, for a considerable distance. Similar to the vulture, too, they acknowledge a king, who is clothed with extremely white feathers, and flies accompanied by other crows, as by satellites. He always takes his *quantum sufficit* of food alone, the remainder of the flock standing around with forbearance, and at a respectful distance. His alar extent concurs with his color to make him quite conspicuous, being of about thirty-five inches.

In our consideration of the PIE KIND, it is not to be expected that the limits of this sketch will permit us to touch upon the

one-twentieth part of its varieties that are to be found in Paraguay. In this class naturalists have placed a much greater variety of birds than any other family contains, and though they have some few qualities in common, in many others they are more or less widely dissimilar. It is a well-established opinion, for instance, that strict connubial fidelity is one of their virtues, and that, though living in harmony with each other, every species is true to its kind, and transmits an unpolluted race to its posterity. To this rule, however, we think there are many exceptions among the extensive tribe of Parrots, and perhaps one or two others. We placed the Crow of Paraguay and its affinities among the rapacious birds, because there it decidedly prefers all kinds of carrion, and is not omnivorous. Having had for so many centuries a sufficiency of that kind of food, its nature has probably undergone a corresponding change. Among those birds most common to our own country, and which are alike found in all parts of South America during our winter, we may mention the ORIOLES, chief singers of the forest; the BLACK-BIRDS, which are polygamous; the KING-BIRDS; the FLY-CATCHERS, with all their varieties; together with the INDIGO-BIRD and the MOCKING-BIRD, *Surdus Polyglottus* of Wilson. This unrivalled singer makes the perennial forests vocal with his strains of powerful melody, learned from other birds in other climes. Nevertheless, the birds of Paraguay are much more musical than is generally allowed to be the case in tropical climes. By far the majority of our birds spend nearly half the year either in Mexico or South America, compelled to this course from the variability of our climate. But then these birds are silent, and seemingly occupied with the duty of supporting life. They resort to North America to breed during our summer. It is then, during the labors and the pleasures connected with their progeny, when singing their songs of love to their mates, or trilling forth some long note of defiance to a rival male, that we hear their delicious strains. But we doubt not that many of these birds range not only from Hudson's Bay to Mexico, but from Hudson's Bay to Cape Horn; and there are numerous tribes of them which seek the high elevation and

temperate climate of the southern part of Paraguay, just without the tropic, and there select their mates, raise their offspring, and delight the inhabitants with their songs. One great cause, perhaps, for their abundance in this region, may be found in the fact that Paraguay affords the first forests which South America contains, north of Cape Horn and east of the Andes, and the *pampas* cannot serve as a breeding-place for the *PIE KIND*, who all nestle in trees. The *INDICATOR*, or *HONEYGUIDE*, is one of the most useful among them, for these forests contain large quantities of honey, which it would be difficult to find without some conductor to its various receptacles. This is found in the *Indicator*, which, calling with a shrill note morning and night, furnishes a certain clue to the concealed treasure.

We come now to the *PARROT* and its *VARIETIES*. With the exception of the *Canary*, this bird is probably the best known among us of all foreign birds, and is valued not only for its beauty, but also its power of imitating to a great degree the human voice. Fortunate it is for the ears of our countrymen, that our forests do not abound with them, like those of Paraguay. They would soon find that there is one sort of music which has no charms. We have often thought, when travelling there, that if Milton had ever been surrounded by a chorus of Parrots, alternating with an antiphon of monkeys, he would have been tempted to introduce their horrible noise into the description of his Pandemonium.

Some two hundred varieties have been classified, from the proud and stormy Macaw tribe, down through all gradations of size and color to the smallest Parakeet, scarce larger than a humming-bird. They are all harmoniously beautiful, all discordantly noisy, and more than half the known varieties make the forests of Paraguay resound with a concert which, to our ears, was perfectly abominable. To those, however, who are fonder of regaling their stomach than their ears, these birds offer a most delicate repast, particularly whilst feeding upon the ripe *guava*. According to father Joseph Labrador, the Brazilians and Guaranis have a method of producing whatever tints in the feathers of these birds they desire. They pull them out by the roots when near the moulting season, and

rub the place from which they have been plucked, until it grows red and blood flows from it; they then press into the sockets of the old feathers, juice of any color they wish, and thus impart the desired hue to the new growth. We consider the Parrot tribe as decidedly polygamous, and consequently believe that their varieties are constantly increasing, and probably at the present time number many hundreds.

Amongst the feathered tribes, however, the most interesting in its form, its color, and its habits, is the *DOVE* or *PIGEON*. Faithful to its mate, its affectionate cares and devotion share the duties of incubation, and render domestic ties a pleasure. Ten varieties are found in Paraguay, of which we know little more than the plumage. To this class we must add the *TOUCAN*, a bird whose bill is nearly as large as its whole body. The *Toucan* is one of the most remarkable birds in creation, and very beautiful. It lives upon the same food as the Parrot, and its flesh is very delicate and of superior flavor for the table. It builds its nest like a Woodpecker, within the hollow of a tree, making only a hole large enough for ingress and egress. Here it sits guarding the entrance with its great beak, and it is a defence sufficiently formidable to keep off all the attacks of birds and serpents, and monkeys, more mischievous than all. There are many varieties, appearing at all seasons. The *Red-billed* and the *Ariel* are the largest, and are seen in vast numbers throughout the forests.

The beautiful family of *CHATTERERS* claims a place here, as one of those most sought after by naturalists. For aught we know, all the varieties of the Brazilian forest, and some others besides, are met with in this country. Edwards mentions several species in the region of the Amazon river, the most remarkable of which is the *UMBRELLA CHATTERER*, *Cephalopeternus ornatus*. This species is one of the rarest and most curious of South American birds, and derives its name from a tall crest of slender feathers upon the head. Like all Chatterers, they are fruit-eaters, and a delicacy for the table. We must pass over many other remarkable birds which belong to the *Pie kind*, as much from want of information concerning them, as to allow of a brief consideration of the remaining orders in Ornithology.

Paraguay presents the same marks of unsparring beneficence and bountiful profusion in the POULTRY KIND. This granivorous tribe makes no pretensions to any connubial attachment or fidelity, and contains a vast number of birds as yet undomesticated. Whilst the true originals of some of its domestic species are, through the lapse of ages, entirely extinct, our epicurean entertainments have a wide range in the future, as yet almost unattempted. In addition to the varieties of the common cock, peacock, turkey and guinea hen, very many species of the grouse, bustard, quail, pheasant, and some two or three of the partridge, abound in all parts of the Republic. The pheasant is not only one of the most beautiful of birds, but one of the most easily tamed; and it is strange that with the knowledge of this fact, our poultry yards are not stocked with them. Frank Forrester, (Mr. H. W. Herbert,) in his able sporting papers, positively says, that there is not a single variety of the pheasant in America. Mr. Herbert is mistaken. He may answer for North America, and for aught we know, some parts of South America, but he has never been in Paraguay. Natural History hitherto has drawn far larger resources in specimens and various species of this bird from the Eastern world than from our hemisphere; and though Asia probably contains a much greater variety, America will yet add another store to the family. The TRUMPETER is most abundant from the Amazon to the La Plata, and is characterized by the wonderful noise which it makes, and from which it was named. It is easily familiarized, and its attachment is strong.

Of birds of the SPARROW KIND we have but little to say. Chiefly distinguished for their song, the large majority of them are occupants of the temperate zones. The presumption is, also, that possessing but little fidelity, promiscuous intercourse continually increases the varieties. The latter remark may, in a great measure, apply to the extended tribe of HUMMING-BIRDS, which deserve a more extended notice, and to which man has been unable to place any bounds. These lovely and delicate beings have ever excited the admiration of their discoverers, and, indeed, of every one who has observed them, either revelling in their native glades, or, shorn of their chief beau-

ties, eternally at rest, in the artificial display of our museums. Sir Wm. Jardine mentions the historical fact, that the Mexicans used their feathers for superb mantles in the time of Montezuma. The Indian could appreciate their loveliness, delighting to adorn his bride with gems and jewelry plucked from the starry frontlets of these beauteous forms. Every epithet which the ingenuity of language could invent, has been employed to depict the richness of their coloring: the lustre of the topaz, of the emerald and the ruby, has been compared with them, and applied in their names. "The hue of roses steeped in liquid fire," and even the "Cheveux de l'astre du jour" of the imaginative Buffon, fall short of their versatile tints. These birds belong exclusively to the New World, and almost entirely to its tropical portion. In the wild and uncultivated parts of the latter, they inhabit those forests of magnificent trees, overhung with Lianas and the superb tribe of Bignonaceæ, the huge trunks clothed with a rich drapery of parasites, whose blossoms only yield in beauty to the sparkling tints of their airy tenants. The enthusiastic Audubon calls the only species of the Humming-bird that is found with us, "the glittering fragment of a rainbow." From the *Trochilus gigas*, a bird about eight inches in length, to the *T. Gouldii* or *T. magnificus*, an inch and a half long, all sizes, tints and colors are found, far beyond the power of language or the painter's pencil to depict. Description is baffled, and an idea can only be conveyed by likening them to some familiar object, such as the bright and changing hue of steel, and other metals, united to the splendid tints of precious stones. M. Lesson's work contains two hundred and nineteen plates, and an account of nearly as many varieties already discovered. Yet when we think of the vast tropical expanse yet unknown to any save the Lord of the trackless forest, we may safely say, that the knowledge of the synonyms and economy of this wonderful tribe of birds is yet almost in its infancy.

Thus we leave the land birds of Paraguay, happy if we shall succeed in drawing the attention of naturalists to their beautiful selves, and still more beautiful country. In yet more astonishing profusion most kinds of WATER BIRDS find a rich

support in the magnificent rivers and lakes of interior South America, and, more local in their habits in tropical climes, than the generality of land birds, they are almost totally unknown a few hundred miles from the sea-board. Among birds of the CRANE KIND, or WADERS, *Grallatores*, we can mention SANDERLINGS, PLOVER, ten varieties, CRANES, HERONS, and BITTERNS, in far greater number, but probably differing little, save in plumage, from the same species with us. We rank among the latter, though rather a separate species, the SCOLOPACEOUS COURLAN, a solitary bird, and almost restricted to Paraguay. The banks of the Rio de la Plata and its confluent streams, are copiously supplied with RED FLAMINGOES, SPOONBILLS, AVOSETS, and four or five varieties of CURLEWS and SANDPIPERS. Many more of the lively SNIPE and delicious RAIL, promiscuously *cotillionize* in millions all over the country. And the GALLINUTES, or WATER HEN, superior in its size and plentiful in its numbers, offers an opportunity of wholesale execution to the ardent sportsman.

To these may be added a vast collection of the DUCK KIND, or WEBB-FOOTED BIRDS. Amongst the number, there are many varieties of TERN, some of which owe their discovery to Prince Neuwied, in Brazil; also GULLS of several species, the principal of which are the BLACKBACKED GULL, or COBB, *Larus Marinus*, Linn. This bird, though ordinarily feeding upon fish, may frequently be found in company with Vultures and Eagles, discussing the merits of a putrid carcass. To these least useful of the webb-footed birds, we must append the most graceful, in the SWAN. And, notwithstanding the assertion of the poet, BLACK SWANS are found in all the rivers of southern South America, and their skins, with the feathers attached, are an article of considerable commercial value in the regions of the La Plata.

In reference to the WILD GEESE and DUCKS, with their very abundant varieties, we must be content to quote Father Dobrizhoffer when he says, "Water-fowl are so numerous, and of such various kinds, that it would fill a volume to describe them properly." "But of ducks there is such a variety and number, not only in the lakes but in the rivers also, that the water is oftentimes defiled so as to render

it unfit to be drunk." Probably some thirty varieties might reward the labors of the ornithologist, including therein many species of TEAL, and SHAG, and DARTERS in profusion. We conclude this enumeration with the PELICAN. A cosmopolite, it seems to be regardless of climate, latitude or longitude. No bird wanders so widely, or inhabits such a diversity of countries. Whether in Red-Russia or the Siberian lakes; along the Mediterranean, in Asia Minor, Greece, or the Propontis; or whitening the lakes of Egypt in winter, and the banks of Strymon in summer; whether on the Senegal and the Gambia, or at Madagascar, Siam, or the Philippines; whether on the coasts of Patagonia, California, Florida, or up to the 61° of northern latitude, nothing deters the wandering propensities of this, the largest of the webb-footed birds. It is, however, very scarce in the interior of America, for its favorite resort is on the seashore.

Of the ICHTHYOLOGY of Paraguay, we are unable to write much that would interest the reader. We have never seen there any North American or European fish of our acquaintance. We have, however, a list of fifteen names of fish indigenous to these lakes and rivers, but not one of which it is in our power to classify. These are all of most excellent flavor for the table, and comprise all sizes as high as a hundred pounds weight; their colors, likewise, being very various and beautiful. Among some of the more peculiar, we may mention the ARMADO, a Spanish term applied to it from the fact that the fish is armed almost at all points with sharp fins, with which it endeavors to wound the fisherman whilst securing it, emitting at the same time a loud harsh noise. Its head is round and incased in a very strong shell. Its eyes are small and surrounded by a circle of golden color, and its mouth is covered with a shaggy beard. The VAGRE is a species of Trout, very much resembling our brook Trout in its habits, and affording equal pleasure to the angler. LA VIEGA bears the similitude both of a fish and a turtle; for possessing the form of the one, it has the strong horny shell of the other. The RAYA is similar in form to an oval dish with a flat surface, and its mouth is placed in the middle of the body. Moreover, it is armed

with a formidable sting, said to be capable of inflicting death, unless prevented by immediate attention. But the *PALOMETA* is really a dangerous creature, and may, with propriety, be called the fresh-water shark. Its jaws are armed with fourteen very sharp triangular teeth, with which it is fully able to cut in two the human body.

One species of fish, like the *Doras Costatus* of Demerara, has the singular property of travelling over land in seasons of severe drought, in search of water, and from the superabundance of its secretory ducts it never becomes dry as long as life continues. We must refer the reader to the fourth volume of Humboldt's Personal Narrative for an account of the *GYMNOTUS* or ELECTRICAL EEL. It may be sufficient to observe here, that their electric power far surpasses that of any known species of the *TORPEDO*. A kind of CRAB, as well as both land and water TURTLES, are most abundant here, and excellent for the table. A good account of the latter may be found in Edwards's "Voyage." SHRIMP, the delicacy of which all travellers to tropical America will readily recall, are very numerous in the fresh-water rivers of Paraguay. But they are extremely small, and when taken by the net, they are first dried in the sun and then preserved as household provision. We recommend to M. Agassiz to take a trip to the interior of South America, before he returns to Europe again. There he may do more for Ichthyology in a short time, than he has yet done during his whole life, though that is enough for a full measure of fame and renown.

Of ENTOMOLOGY we are obliged to acknowledge our utter and entire ignorance, and must be content with saying that South America affords to the lovers of insects the most boundless and untrodden field in nature. The naturalist Ray asserts that he discovered in England, within two or three miles of his residence, upwards of three hundred different kinds of one tribe of insects, (*papiliones*.) Therefore we would say to the ambitious Entomologist, that, should he be endued with the life and health of Methusaleh to follow this pursuit, we doubt whether, when he came to die, he would have become acquainted with a tithe of the insects contained within a thousand square miles of Paraguay.

Under this head, however, we must notice two or three pests which do not add to the otherwise exceeding comfort of a residence in this lovely region. The first is the CHIGOE or JIGGER. The male is not unlike the common flea, and the abdomen of the female, like that of the queen of the white ants, the *Cocci*, enlarges to an enormous extent. These insects penetrate the skin of the toes near the nail, and there nestle and breed with wonderful rapidity; so that the sufferers soon behold their extremities in an awfully deformed and horribly disgusting condition, and a stranger would suppose that they must die by inches. But these insects are easily removed at first, and cause no inconvenience. Moreover a sure preventive is the constant use of shoes and stockings. Again Humboldt, Bonpland, and Gmelin all mention a species of gad-fly which attacks mankind. It deposits its egg under the skin of the abdomen, in which the grub remains six entire months. If molested it sinks deeper and deeper, and, creating ulcers or inflammation, often causes death. This is also simply provided against by clothing.

But there is a plague far worse than both of these, in what we commonly call the *seven years' locust*. This pestiferous insect is only a visitor within a circle around Asuncion of about fifteen leagues. In this they literally cover the land as with a shroud, for they bring grief and mourning to all. The time of their appearance is not regular, varying from two to five, or more generally eleven years. None can vouch from whence they come or whither they go. Two kinds, the red and the black, are recognized among these. Their eggs are deposited just beneath the surface of the ground, the average of each female being about sixty, adhering together in an oval foam. Their disappearance always takes place upon the first moonlight after their coming, and they leave no growing thing behind them, but all is a scene of wide-spread desolation.

Let us turn now to more agreeable and profitable topics, so far, at least, as commercial interests are concerned. The vegetable kingdom, in Paraguay, presents the richest attractions, not merely to the professional botanist, but to the important class who devote themselves to mercantile enterprise. We shall pass over the splen-

did varieties of plants and flowers which are only ornamental. The MEDICINAL HERBS that abound in the greatest profusion are Rhubarb, Sarsaparilla, Jalap, Bryonia Indica, Sassafras, Holy wood, Dragonsblood, Balsam of Copaiva, Nux Vomica, Liquorice and Ginger. To these, (though the product of a tree,) we may add one of the most valuable productions in the world, viz., the Peruvian or Jesuits bark. Of dye-stuffs, too, there is an immense variety. The Cochineal, which is indeed the production of insects, but requiring the food of a species of the Cactus plant, Indigo, Vegetable Vermilion, Saffron, Golden-rod; with others, producing all the tints of dark red, black and green; and the Tataiuvá, which affords a yellow of great durability, much used in the dyeing of wool. Many of the forest trees yield valuable gums not yet familiar to commerce or medicine; but they comprise some of the most delicious perfumes and incense that can be imagined. Others again are like Amber, hard, brittle, and insoluble in water. Some Cedars yield a gum equal to Gum Arabic; others a natural glue, which, when once dried, is unaffected by wet or dampness. The *Seringa*, or Rubber tree, the product of which is now almost a monopoly from Para, crowds the forests, ready to give up its riches to the first comer; and the sweet-flavored Vanilla modestly flourishes, as if inviting the hand of man.

But it is with the forest trees of Paraguay that we love most to deal. Giants! there they are, vast and noble in their aspect, and able, as it were, to utter for themselves the sublime music of the wilderness. Still unknown, for the most part, as regards their worth or their beauties, they spread abroad their sturdy arms: of incredible girth, they tower aloft, and many tribes of the ANIMATED CREATION luxuriate beneath their shade, and from gambol to rest, and from rest to gambol again, live among their branches. Huge vines start from the teeming soil, and snake-like, shoot their serpentine coils round the trunks and through the branches, binding tree to tree. And thirty-seven species of the Passion flower, America's native beauty, color each twig with glorious tints of a summer sky. We shall present to our readers, however, in a more distinct form, the

principal varieties of the Timber trees of Paraguay.

1. First we shall place the LAPACHO, more admirable by far than English oak or Indian teak for shipping. It is of immense size; yellow color; lasts an age; is attacked neither by worms nor rot, in air or water. We have seen timbers of the Lapacho that have supported the roofs of houses, in Buenos-Aires, for two hundred years. They are now as sound as ever, and, to all appearance, capable of performing the same service for a thousand years to come.

2. URUNDY.—This tree is higher and thicker than the Lapacho. It is beautifully varied, like rosewood, from red to black; is excessively hard, and takes a splendid polish. It never rots, nor is it affected by worms. There are three varieties of the Urundy.

3. QUEBRACHO.—Medicinal bark. Same as Urundy in color and texture.

4. ESPINILLO and ALGAROBO, are very hard, of red color, and similar in quality to the Urundy.

5. CEDRO.—There are many kinds of this noblest of trees, but the red is considered the best. They are of immense size, and all yield gums of varied value. We are within bounds when we say that we have met them frequently eight and ten feet in diameter.

6. PALO AMARGO.—This wood is very buoyant, and easily bent when fresh. It is fine-grained, like white pine, and highly useful for shipping. It is very white.

7. PETEREVUN.—This wood is unsurpassed for masts and spars. It is white, when dry, not liable to suffer from worms, and has a proper elasticity, and great durability in the air.

8. PALO DE LANZA, is a white wood and splits easily. It is useful for household purposes.

9. CALANDRO is well adapted for cabinet work. It is red and hard, as well as durable, and exceedingly beautiful.

10. TATORE is used in house-building. The heart of the tree does not rot.

11. TATAIUYA we have already mentioned as producing a useful dye. The wood is durable.

12. CARANDAY.—This tree is one of many species of the PALM. It is very hard, and is unassailable by rot or worms, either

above or under the ground. When green, the wood is white and soft; but when seasoned, it is black, tough, and wiry, and sounds like a bell when struck.

13. YGUYRA-PEPE.—This is a superior wood for agricultural implements. The heart is white, but the remainder a deep red. It yields an odoriferous gum.

14. CURUPAY and CEBIL produce bark for tanning.

15. LAUREL is used for charcoal, and YSY produces medicinal gum of great value.

16. The ALFAROA is medicinal, being diuretic, and in some varieties sudorific. It also makes an agreeable alcoholic drink.

17. TAMARINDS and COCOA are found all over the country. The MULBERRY TREE furnishes saffron dye. The SEIBO, when green, is spongy and soft as cork, and can be cut like an apple; but when dry it is so hard, that axes cannot hew it.

Again we have the PALO DE VIVORA, or snake tree, whose leaves are an infallible cure for the poisonous bites of serpents. The STERARO produces a cordage from the stringy portion of its bark, which is superior in strength and durability to the best hemp; in fact, it has supported with a single strand sixty pounds more than hemp! The PALO DE LECHE, or milk-tree, may be called a vegetable cow; and the PALO DE BORRACHO, the drunken tree, a vegetable distillery. The YCICA resin is found at the roots of trees under ground, and is a pitch ready prepared to pay the seams of vessels. The tree called ABATY TIMBABY is very large. In the heat of the sun it sheds a quantity of gum, of a golden color, and clear as the purest crystal. Of this gum, the lower orders of the Spaniards and the foresters make crosses, earrings, and other ornaments. Although as fragile as glass, the gum can be melted by no moisture. It might be found to contain valuable properties. Hitherto no one has made a trial of its virtues.

Some thirty different fruits, comprising all the known and some unknown tropical species, abound plentifully. Our apples, pears, peaches, *et cetera*, are grateful to the taste; but a rich luscious pine-apple, or orange, fresh plucked from the tree and eaten before breakfast, is much more so.

But we have probably said enough on

this part of our subject. Our object has been to exhibit, in a slight sketch, the great wealth of Paraguay, in the hope of enlightening, to some small extent, the great ignorance that everywhere prevails regarding it. To this end we have already mentioned roots, gums and resins enough. We have found the forests spontaneously producing everything necessary for the comfort and luxury of mankind, from the beautiful cotton tree that affords him clothing, to the colors which suit his fancy as a dye; and from the woods that furnish his ship and house, or ornament his escritoire, to the herb that cures his sickness, or the gum that delights his olfactories. It is only necessary to add, that the climate is favorable to all the useful grains and table vegetables, with delicious fruits to support and gratify.

Of the ANTHROPOLOGY of Paraguay, we have said nothing. *Blumenbach* himself would be puzzled to tell the original of some of the mongrel breeds to be found there. But the upper classes have ever been much more regardful of their blood, than in any other part of Spanish or Portuguese America; and they continue to this day pure and uncontaminated. They are brave, stout and healthy; hospitable and simple-hearted, and true and faithful, to a degree that would be perfectly astonishing in this or any other civilized country. Perfect confidence in the government, and subordination to the laws, are two of their cardinal virtues, and security for life and property is the blessed consequence. They are an agricultural people, philosophically content with what they have, until they can get more; but they are determined, nevertheless, to gain the navigation of the river Paraná. Tyranny enough they have already suffered, to have learned how to escape its toils in future, and their chief desire is to learn those arts which may conduce to their comfort and happiness, and elevate their country to its proper position among the nations of the world. In return for that knowledge, their commerce will bring to us much that we have never seen, and will cheapen for our manufacturers what we already import from other parts of South America, while to the naturalist and the historian, the most extensive fields of undeveloped richness and inexpressible beauty will open at command.

H O P E.

I DARE not sing of lofty things,
Of heroes, demigods, and kings ;
And yet, my song hath no mean wings :
Were they but grown,
Proud, over the head of carping fools,
It, long, had flown.

Feebly the yearling falcon flies ;
Strong tumbling torrents humbly rise ;
Nor at the first with tempests tries
His arms the pine ;
Slow planned, the solemn domes arise
That slow decline.

Swift deeds but meet the swifter fate,
And forward buds an earlier date ;
Then think not quickly to be great,
But in thy mind,
Long meditate the mighty toil
By thee designed.

In the deep bosom of the past,
Lie riches of the centuries vast,
Alchemic gold, from heaven down cast :
Thou art sole heir
To that great wealth ; it waits thy hand,
And fabric care.

Oh ! much avails the strong desire—
The bosom touched with restless fire—
The strife, that sunward still, and higher
Would ceaseless rise !
More in the strife than in the crown,
The virtue lies.

Still, at the mountain's wooded base,
The fledgling hawk, though proud, may chase
A game too humble for the race
Of stronger plumes :
So may the soul *her* hour await,
Whom hope illumes.

And should my day be limited,
Let conscious worth my mind bested :
Glory may wreath the honored head,
But cannot rise
With crown of stars to match the worth
In Hope that lies.

THE PROSE WRITINGS OF ANDRÉ CHÉNIER.*

EVERY one at all conversant with French literature has heard of the young poet, who "struck his lyre at the foot of the scaffold," and whose last verses were interrupted by the summons of the executioner. It is not so generally known that this man was one of the most vigorous, independent, and sagacious writers of the exciting period at which he lived. The first feeling on reading his political essays is one of surprise, that writers on the French Revolution should have alluded to him only as the poet—or rather the youth who *would have been* a poet, had he not perished so young. Even his *cousin*, M. Thiers, while going so far as to call him a *distinguished* poet,† makes not the least mention of his controversial writings.

Now in this we are persuaded that Chénier has not been fairly treated. His poetry, rough and fragmentary as most of it is, does not put him very high on Parnassus—even the Gallic Parnassus. His longer productions are principally imitations of the classics; and everybody knows what French imitations of the classics are, and that they resemble the Greek originals about as much as the domestic madonnas, so common in a certain city of this Union, do the Raphaels at Florence. To our mind the man who could translate

ἀλλήλας λαλῶντας τέον γάμον ἢ κυάρισσαι,

C'est ce bois qui de joie et s'agite et murmure,

had fallen very far short of the spirit of Theocritus. In shorter pieces, (such as his stanzas to Fanny, and other erotics,) where he had, partially at least, escaped from the influence of his classic pseudo-models, there is more poetic fire. But even his last and best known verses,

"Comme un dernier rayon, comme un dernier zéphyre," &c.,

owe their celebrity more to the unexampled circumstances under which they were written, than to any intrinsic merit. And, generally, his "rough sketches," (*ébauches*), as Thiers appropriately calls them, have been praised by his compatriots, chiefly for the *promise* they gave, as if, to use his own dying words, he "had something in his head," which would have come out with more time and opportunity. Now this sort of reputation is, we repeat it, very far below Chénier's deserts. And we would vindicate for him, not the vague and doubtful renown of a *possible* poet, but the real and tangible character of an excellent political writer, with a strong and clear style, an indomitable spirit of independence, and a sagacity which, considering the circumstances in which he was placed, is but faintly depicted by the epithet extraordinary. Before proceeding to justify this claim of ours in detail, we will mention two facts which may, at any rate, tend to gain us a hearing. It was André Chénier whom the conservative secession from the Jacobin Club, selected to prepare their manifesto and profession of faith. It was André Chénier who composed that letter in which the unfortunate Louis XVI. made his last appeal to the people.

Louis Chénier, a French consul, married a Greek beauty. His third son, André, was born at Constantinople, in 1762. Sent to France in his infancy, and liberally educated, he entered the army, and at the age of twenty was in quarters at Strasburg as a sub-lieutenant. A soldier's life, in time of peace, is particularly unsatisfactory to an active and ambitious young man. In six months André quitted his profession forever, and returned to Paris. There he began to study *furiously*. He seems to have proposed for himself what Chatham is said to have proposed for his son, "to learn the whole Cyclopædia." As is usual

* Œuvres en Prose d'André Chénier. Paris: Charles Gosselin. 1840.

† "Dans le nombre étaient deux poètes célèbres, Roucher, l'auteur des *Mois*, et le jeune André Chénier, qui lassa d'admirables ébauches."—Thiers, *Revolution Française*, vi. 200.

in such cases, he read himself nearly to death. His health was partially restored by a journey in Switzerland, during which he made some efforts to commit his impressions to paper; but his enthusiasm was too buoyant to be thus fixed, and he had not sufficient command over his own feelings. Next he went to England, in the suite of the ambassador, (the Count of Lucerne,) a very likely way of taming any excess of spirits. With England he was displeased, as most foreigners, and especially most Frenchmen, may well be on short acquaintance. Yet his penetrating mind fully appreciated the strong common sense of the English people; and the contrast which he subsequently drew between the political clubs of London and those of Paris, was not at all flattering to his countrymen.

It was not till 1790 that he established himself at Paris, and applied himself seriously to poetic composition. The state of public affairs soon turned his talents in another direction. The *Friends of the Constitution*, afterwards so formidable as the *Jacobins*, had in their progress towards anarchy, eliminated from themselves a number of moderate men, among whom were De Pauge and Condorcet. The result was the *Society of 1789*, a society whose object was pretty well indicated by its title. Chénier joined these men, and to him as the best or boldest, or both, of their writers, was the task assigned of putting forth an official statement of their principles, of "defining their position," as our phrase is. This he did in an essay on the momentous question, "*Who are the real enemies of the French?*" He begins with a graphic sketch of the condition of France at that time:—

"When a great nation, after having grown gray in careless error, wearied at length of evils and oppression, wakes from this long lethargy, and by a just and lawful insurrection enters upon all its rights, and overturns the order of things which violated all those rights, it cannot in an instant find itself calmly established in its new condition. The strong impulse given to so weighty a mass, makes it vacillate for some time before it can recover its equilibrium. After all that is bad has been destroyed, and those charged with the execution of reforms are pursuing their work in haste, we must not hope that a people still heated with emotion, and exalted by success, can stay quiet and wait peace-

ably for the new government that is preparing for them. All imagine they have acquired the right of co-operating in the government, and demand the exercise of that right with an unreasonable impatience. Every one wishes, not merely to assist and protect, but even to preside over a part, at least, of the fabric; and as the general interest of these partial reforms is not so striking to the multitude, their unanimity is less thorough and active. The number of feet retards the general progress; the number of arms the general action.

"In this state of uncertainty, politics take hold of every mind. All other labors are suspended; all the old-fashioned kinds of industry are banished; men's heads are heated; they originate ideas, or follow those of others; they pursue them; they see nothing else; the patriots who at first made but one body, because they looked to but one end, begin to discover differences, in most cases imaginary, among themselves; every one labors and struggles; every one wishes to show himself; every one would carry the flag; every one in his principles, his speeches, his actions, wishes to go beyond all others.

* * * * *

"These agitations, provided that a new order of things, wisely and promptly established, does not give them time to go too far, may not be injurious, nay, may turn out a public benefit, by exciting a sort of patriotic emulation; and if while all this is going on, the nation is enlightening and fashioning itself by really liberal principles; if the representatives of the people are not interrupted in the work of forming a constitution; and if the whole political machine is tending towards a good government, all these trifling inconveniences will vanish of themselves, and there is no cause for alarm. But if we see that, far from disappearing, the germs of political hatred are taking deeper root; if we see grave accusations and atrocious imputations multiplied at random; if we see everywhere a false spirit and false principles working blindly, as if by some fatality, in the most numerous class of citizens; if we see at the same moment in every corner of the empire illegal insurrections brought on in the same manner, founded on the same misapprehensions, defended by the same sophistries; if we see frequent appearances in arms on the part of that lowest class of the people, who, understanding nothing, having nothing, possessing no interest in anything, can only sell themselves to whoever will buy them; then such symptoms must be alarming."

Here was enough to fix upon Chénier the fatal enmity of the Jacobins. What, the "poor and virtuous people" that Robespierre delighted to prate about, ready to "sell themselves to whoever would buy

them!" The young conservative was a doomed man already.

He goes on to say that such a deplorable state of things must be owing to the machinations of some public enemies. Who are these enemies? Not the Austrians, fatigued and exhausted by their own wars; nor the English, "that nation about which the Parisians talk so much and know so little;"* nor yet the emigrants. These last have been influenced by fear, prejudice and ignorance. The surest way to bring them back and make them good citizens is to present such a spectacle of order and tranquillity as will show them that their fears and prejudices are unfounded. But even admitting their hostility, what can such a faction accomplish if the State is united? And this leads to the first conclusion, that the real public enemies are *those causes which prevent the re-establishment of public tranquillity*. Now what are these causes? "Everything that has been done in this revolution, good or bad, is owing to *writings*: in them, perhaps, then, we shall find the source of the evils that threaten us." And, accordingly, he proceeds to show that these *public enemies* are the *encouragers and apologists of popular excesses*. After a hasty summary of these excesses, he exclaims, with a natural and virtuous indignation—"And to think that there are writers blood-thirsty or cowardly enough to come forward as the protectors and excusers of these murders! That they dare to abêt them! That they dare to point out this and that victim! That they have the audacity to give the name of *popular justice* to these horrible violations of all justice and all law! To be sure, the power of hanging, like all other powers, is ultimately referable to the people, but it is a frightful thing, if this is the only power which they are not willing to exercise by their representatives."

Then follow several pages of just and powerful invective against "those people to whom all law is burdensome, all restraint insupportable, all rule odious; people for whom an honest life is the most oppressive of yokes! They hated the old government, not because it was bad, but because it was a government; they will hate the new; they will hate all, whatever

be their nature." How accurately Chénier foresaw what would be the consequence of giving in to these people may be seen from the following extract:—

"Now, as I was saying, is it not evident that, on the one hand, the workmen and day-laborers of every class, who only live by constant and steady work, abandoning themselves to this turbulent indolence, will no longer be able to gain a subsistence, and before long, stimulated by hunger, and the rage which hunger inspires, will only think of seeking for money wherever they imagine it may be found? On the other hand, it is hardly necessary to say that the farms and workshops thus abandoned will cease to be capable of supplying that income of individuals which alone makes the public income. No more taxes then; consequently no more public service; consequently the upper classes reduced to misery and despair; the army disbanded and pillaging the country; the infamy of a national bankruptcy accomplished and declared; the citizens all in arms against each other. No more taxes; consequently no more government; the National Assembly obliged to abandon its task, and put to flight; universal slaughter and conflagration; provinces, towns, and individuals mutually accusing one another of their common disasters; France torn to pieces by the convulsions of this incendiary anarchy."

There was no want of respectable persons to laugh at these alarms and pity the alarmists. Chénier has a word for these:

"I should like these persons, for our entire satisfaction, to deign to take pen in hand, and prove that these fermentations, these tempests, these continued pangs, have not the tendency which I attributed to them; that they do not produce a spirit of insubordination and want of discipline; or, if they please, that this spirit is not the most formidable enemy of law and liberty. I should like them also to show us what will become of France, if the bulk of the French people, wearied of their own indiscretions and the anarchy resulting from them, wearied of never arriving at the goal which they have themselves continually put further off, should come to believe that liberty is only to be found in disgust of liberty, and, as the remembrance of former evils is readily effaced, should end by regretting their old yoke of quiet degradation."

He proceeds to draw an important distinction:—

"These same persons are never tired of repeating to us that things are preserved by the same means which have acquired them. If by

* Equally true this, at the present day.

this they mean that courage, activity and union are as necessary to preserve liberty as to win it, nothing is more incontrovertible or more irrelevant; but if they understand that in both cases this courage, and activity, and union, are to manifest themselves in the same way and by the same actions, they are very much mistaken. The very contrary is the truth, for in destroying and overthrowing a colossal and unjust power, the more ardent and headlong our courage the more certain our success. But afterwards, when our ground is cleared and we have to rebuild on extensive and durable foundations, when we must make after having unmade, then our courage should be the very reverse of what it was at first. It should be calm, prudent and deliberate; it should manifest itself only in wisdom, tenacity and patience; it should fear to resemble those torrents which ravage without fertilizing. Hence it follows that the means which accomplished the Revolution, if they continue to be employed without addition or qualification, can only destroy its efficiency by hindering the constitution from being established. Hence again it follows that those wild pamphleteers, those unruly demagogues, who, enemies, as we have seen, of all government and all restraint, thundered against old abuses at the beginning of the Revolution, were then right enough,* for they found themselves for the moment united with all honest men in proclaiming the truths which have made us free; but that now they ought not to claim our confidence as a debt, or accuse our want of attention as a want of gratitude, while in using the same expressions and the same declamations against an absolutely new order of things, they are preaching an entirely different doctrine, which would conduct us to a different end."

What remedies and safeguards are to be adopted? Popular errors are apt to arise from ignorance, rather than deliberate wickedness. The real principles of civil liberty must be carefully inculcated. Here are some of the things which every citizen ought to know and feel:—

"That there can be no happiness and freedom in society without government and public order.

"That there can be no private wealth, unless the public revenue, or in other words, the public wealth, is secure.

"That the public wealth cannot be secure without public order.

"That, while in despotic states a blind

obedience to the caprices of despots is called public order, under a free constitution founded on the national sovereignty, public order is the only safeguard of persons and property, the only support of the constitution.

"That there is no constitution, unless all the citizens are freed from every illegal restraint, and cordially united to bear the yoke of the law—a yoke always light when all bear it equally.

"That every respectable nation respects itself.

"That every nation which respects itself respects its own laws and magistrates.

"That there is no liberty without law.

"That there is no law if one part of society, be it the majority or not, can forcibly assail and attempt to overthrow the former general wish which has made a law, without waiting for the times and observing the forms indicated by the constitution.

"That, as M. de Condorcet has very well shown in a late publication, when the constitution gives a legal way of reforming a law which experience has shown to be faulty, insurrection against a law is the greatest crime of which a citizen can be guilty; for he thereby dissolves society so far as in him lies, and this is the real crime of treason.

"That there is no liberty if all do not obey the law, and if any one is obliged to obey anything except the law and its agents.

"That no one ought to be arrested, searched, examined, judged, or punished, except according to law and by the agents of the law.

"That the law is only applicable to actions, and that all inquisitions upon opinions and thoughts are no less violations of liberty when exercised in the name of the people, than when exercised in the name of tyrants."

If these brief sentences had been written at the present day; if they had appeared, for instance, in an article of the *Courier and Enquirer*, or our own Review, against the anti-renters, while it could not be denied that they expressed sound political views in a bold and forcible manner, it might be said that they contained nothing very striking or remarkable, but were only a succinct and vigorous statement of what all honest and sane men believed.

* An application of the same principle explains what has puzzled some good men—how Protestants may consistently join with skeptics in opposing the abuses of the Romish Church, where Romanism is the prevailing religion.

But composed, as they were, at a period when of the two great experiments whence we derive most of our political experience, the one was just beginning and the other had not had time to work; a period when the majority of reformers and philosophers thought with Jefferson, that "the old system of government had been tried long enough," and the only escape from it was to rush into the opposite extreme of no government at all except the temporary will of an occasional majority, they denote uncommon sagacity and foresight, and prove that Chénier had the head of a statesman no less than the heart of a patriot. Most particularly worthy of notice is the clearness of his financial views, and the accuracy with which he traced the connection between private and public wealth. It was then a favorite delusion, that the nation might be bankrupt without affecting the fortunes of individuals. The great hero and apostle of democratic despotism who rose out of the Revolution, fell into the contrary error of supposing that the public treasury might continue to be recruited by the appropriation of private capital, not seeing that, to use an ancient but apposite illustration, he was thus killing the goose that laid the golden eggs. It was reserved for a still more modern democracy to invent a still wiser and honester financial expedient—that of repudiating the obligations, while they enjoy the acquisitions, of past generations.

The *Avis au Français* made a great sensation, which was not confined to France. Two circumstances will show the extent and force of its influence. The Polish king Stanislaus Augustus, caused it to be translated into his language, and sent a token of his esteem to the author, who returned a letter of thanks: of course, *the friends of the Constitution* were still more amiably disposed to him, after this royal correspondence. And Condorcet, finding that he could no longer take the lead in the Society of 1789, broke up that association so far as lay in his power, and went straight over to the Jacobins. Chénier's reputation emboldened him to present himself in the following year, (1791,) as a candidate for the assembly; but, as might have been predicted of a man so independent and so much beyond his age, he was unsuccessful. After this he continued to attack and

expose the Jacobins in the *Journal de Paris*, a paper professedly neutral, and publishing communications on any side as paid advertisements, but edited by men of a conservative leaning. The Jacobins were not slow to answer their bold assailant. They set upon him *his own brother*, Maril Joseph, the youngest of the four, who had by some means been inveigled into their ranks. The discussion, which lasted several months and was only broken off at the urgent entreaties of the rest of the family, displayed at the outset, but did not long preserve, the moderation and delicacy demanded by the uncommon position of the parties. The two brothers all but O'Connellized each other. They applied to each other's writings the epithet of *infamous*, then a pet word in the vocabulary of the French journalists, and more usually merited than such pet words generally are. How Joseph Chénier came to take sides with the Jacobins, is not perfectly clear. It seems probable that they flattered his vanity, and made him half believe that his brother's opposition was attributable to envy and jealousy. For when most angry with Andre, his bitterest taunt is to remind him of the election for deputies. A very young man among Democrats may be pardoned for supposing that office and honor are synonymous, and not reflecting that where merit is no longer the test of advancement, the correlative mentioned by Sallust is unavoidable.*

If, however, the leading Jacobins supposed, that by getting up this personal issue they had succeeded in diverting or weakening Andre Chénier's attacks upon them, they were very much mistaken. In the winter of 1792, an event occurred, which, by eminently exposing them to his ridicule, specially marked him out for their vengeance. Two years before, a Swiss regiment had been condemned to the galleys for mutiny. Their offences were gross and unequivocal: they had refused to swear to the Constitution, plundered the regimental chest, and fired upon the National Guard. But General Bouillé, against whom they then revolted, had now proved a traitor to

* "Verum ex his magistratus et imperia, postremo omnis cura rerum publicarum minime mihi hac tempestate capiunda videntur quoniam neque virtuti honos datur, neque illi quibus per fraudem is fuit, utique tuti aut eo magis honesti sunt."—Sallust, Bell. Jug., Cap. 3.

the popular cause. In a fit of childish spite against him, the Swiss were pardoned; on motion of Collot d'Herbois, the amnesty was changed into a triumph; a fête was given to the liberated culprits, and Pétion, as mayor of Paris, presided at it. The intense absurdity of the affair threw into the shade its injustice and danger; and Chénier was not the man to let any of this absurdity be lost. He satirized and ridiculed the Jacobins in prose and verse. He sketched a plan for the new ovation:—

“The Romans used to engrave on brass the names of those generals to whom they granted a triumph, and their titles to so great an honor. I suppose the city of Paris will follow this example, and the happy witnesses of the triumphal entry will read inscribed on the car of victory:

“‘For having revolted with arms in their hands, and replied to the reading of the National Assembly’s decree which recalled them to their duty, ‘that they persisted in their revolt;’

“‘For having been declared *guilty of high treason* by a decree of the National Assembly, Aug. 16, 1790;

“‘For having plundered the regimental chest;

“‘For having spoken these memorable words: *We are not Frenchmen; we are Swiss; we must have money;*

“‘For having fired upon the National Guards of Metz and other places, who marched to Nancy in accordance with the decrees of the National Assembly.’”

And he proceeds, with unanswerable irony:—

“General Bouillé deceived all France and its representatives. None but these Swiss soldiers penetrated his bad designs. They saw that he would take the first opportunity to become a perjured traitor. Accordingly they took up arms against him, and made sure of the regimental chest, for fear this money, falling into his less patriotic hands, should serve the purposes of the counter-revolutionists.

“Since General Bouillé has shown himself a cowardly and treacherous enemy of his country, it is clear that those who fired on him, and on the French citizens marching under his orders by virtue of a decree of the National Assembly, cannot but be excellent patriots.

“In every criminal case there can be but one culpable party. For example, when a murdered man is proved to have been a rogue, it is evident that his murderer must be an honest man.”

The only reply Collot d'Herbois and his myrmidons could make, was to charge Chénier with being hired by the Court,

and to threaten him with assassination—two excellent radical arguments.

Chénier had already drawn a portrait of the Jacobin Club, too faithful not to provoke their fiercest indignation. This sketch was published in the supplement to the *Journal de Paris*, February 26, 1792, just a month before the letter from which we have been quoting:—

“There exists in the midst of Paris a numerous association, holding frequent meetings, open to all who are, or pretend to be, patriots, always governed by leaders visible or invisible, who are continually changing and mutually destroying one another, but who have always the same object—the supreme power; and the same intention—to get that power by whatever means. This society, formed at a moment when liberal principles, though sure to triumph, were not yet completely established, necessarily attracted a great number of citizens who were filled with alarm and warmly attached to the good cause. Many of these had more zeal than knowledge. With them glided in many hypocrites; so did many people who were in debt, without industry, poor through their own indolence, and seeing something to hope for in any change. Many wise and just men who know that in a well regulated State all the citizens do not attend to public affairs, while all ought to attend to their private affairs, have since retired from it; whence it follows that this association must be chiefly composed of some skilful players, who arrange the cards and profit by them, of some subordinate intriguers with whom an habitual eagerness for mischief takes the place of talent, and a large number of idlers, honest, but ignorant and short-sighted, incapable of any bad intention themselves, but very capable of forwarding the bad intentions of others without knowing it.

“This society has generated an infinity of others; towns, boroughs, and villages are full of them. They are almost all under the orders of the parent society, with which they keep up a most active correspondence. It is a body in Paris and the head of a larger body extending over France. In the same way did the Church of Rome *plant the faith*, and govern the world by its congregations of monks.

“This system was imagined and expected two years ago by men of great popularity, who saw very well that it was a means of increasing their power and preserving their popularity, but did not see how perilous an instrument it was. So long as they ruled these societies, all the errors there committed met their warmest approbation; but since they have been blown up by this mine of their own kindling, they detest the excesses which are no longer to their profit, and, talking more truth without possess-

ing more wisdom, combine with honest men in cursing their old master-piece.

"The audience before which these societies deliberate, constitutes their strength; and when one considers that men of business do not neglect their affairs to listen at the debates of a club, and that men of intelligence prefer the silence of the closet, or the peaceable conversation, to the tumult and clamors of these noisy crowds, it is easy to see what must be the ordinary composition of the audience, and further, what sort of language is the best recommendation to them. One simple fallacy is all-sufficient: the constitution being founded on that eternal truth, *the sovereignty of the people*, it is only necessary to persuade the listeners at the club that they are *the people*.

"Lecturers and journal-mongers have generally adopted this definition. Some hundred vagabonds collected in a garden or at a play, or some gangs of robbers and shop-lifters, are impudently denominated *the people*; and never did the most wanton despot receive from the most eager courtier adoration so vile and disgusting, as the base flattery with which two or three thousand usurpers of the national sovereignty are every day intoxicated—thanks to the writers and speakers of these societies!

"As the semblance of patriotism is the only profitable virtue, some men who have been stigmatized by their disgraceful lives run to the club to get a reputation for patriotism, by the violence of their discourses, founding on their riotous declamations, and the passions of the multitude, oblivion of the past and hope for the future, and redeeming themselves from disgrace by impudence. At the clubs are daily proclaimed, sentiments and even principles which threaten the fortunes and the property of all. Under the names of *forestalling* and *monopoly*, industry and commerce are represented as crimes. Every rich man passes for a public enemy. Neither honor nor reputation is spared; odious suspicions and unbridled slander are called *liberty of opinion*. He who demands proof of an accusation, is a suspected man, an enemy of the people. At the clubs, every absurdity is admired, if it be only murderous—every falsehood cherished, if it be only atrocious. * * * Sometimes, indeed, guilty parties are assailed, but they are assailed with a violence, a ferocity, and an unfairness that make them appear innocent."

About the same time, (its exact date and the medium of its publication are uncertain,) Chénier wrote *The Altars of Fear*, a sort of last appeal to the lovers of good order. Its title alludes to the practice of the ancients, who made *fear* a divinity, and erected altars to him.

"To be sure, we have not yet imitated them

to the letter, but, as in all ages profoundly religious men have observed that the heart is the true altar where the Deity chooses to be honored, and that internal adoration is a thousand times more valuable than all the pomp of a magnificent worship intrusted to a small number of persons, and confined to certain places by express consecration, we may say that fear had never more truly altars erected to it, than now in Paris; that it was never honored with a more general worship; that this whole city is its temple; that all respectable people have become its pontiffs, offering to it the daily sacrifice of their opinions and their conscience."

The mob commit excesses; personal privacy and personal liberty are invaded; the respectable people say nothing against it or about it, "*for fear of being called aristocrats.*"

"The simple sound of this word *aristocrat* stupefies the public man, and attacks the very principle of motion in him. He wishes the success of the good, with all his heart; he is making zealous exertions that way, and would sacrifice all his fortune to it: in the midst of his action, let him hear those four fatal syllables pronounced against him, and he trembles, he grows pale, the sword of the law falls from his grasp. Now it is clear enough, that Cicero will never be anything better than an *aristocrat*, to take Clodius or Cataline's word for it: if, then, Cicero is afraid, what will become of us?"

It must be plead, however, in excuse for these respectable people who said nothing *for fear of being called aristocrats*, that they had pretty urgent motives for silence. To be unpopular at that day, was to have your head cut off: the terms were convertible. There are many among us, to whom such reproaches are infinitely more applicable, men who will not lift up their voices against some popular abuse or injustice or prejudice, for fear of being called federalist or aristocrat; although, thank God! to call a man federalist or aristocrat neither knocks him on the head nor even takes a cent out of his pocket. And when we hear a man complaining of the *tyranny of the majority* and *popular intimidation* because his independent conduct has caused his fellow-townsmen to refuse him their voices at an election, or made some honest editor afraid to publish his communications, we would just refer him to Chénier, who was putting his neck under the axe every time he took pen in hand.

The momentous tenth of August came,

and that notorious popular potentate whom our saucy friends over the water have facetiously denominated "the Yankee Justinian," had the supreme jurisdiction in Paris. The *Journal de Paris* was put down *vi et armis*, and its conductors and contributors precipitately scattered. Chénier was in imminent danger; many thought that he must have fallen a victim to the popular fury, and Wieland, the German poet, wrote to inquire *if he were yet alive*. But he was not dead yet, nor even silent; only his writings were now anonymous or pseudonymous. Owing to this fact, nearly all that he published in the autumn and winter of 1792-3 has been lost. It is certain, however, that he was the author of the letter in which Louis after his condemnation vainly appealed to the French people. After the king's death his friends persuaded him to quit Paris for Versailles, where he remained a whole year. By that time most of his personal enemies had disappeared, some torn to pieces by wolves, and some by their fellow Jacobins. But Collot d'Herbois still lived, and his power nearly equalled Robespierre's.

On the 6th of January, 1794, Chénier was arrested. The immediate and ostensible cause of his arrest was a visit to a suspected lady at Passy. The proceeding was utterly illegal, even according to such scanty remains of law as the Terrorists had preserved for themselves, for Chénier was not under the local jurisdiction of the man who seized him, and had a safe conduct and certificate of good citizenship from the authorities of his *quartier*. Indeed the gaoler of the Luxemburg prison refused to receive him, but the functionary at St. Lazare was less scrupulous.

As Joseph Chénier had been an influential Jacobin and a member of the Convention, there were not wanting persons afterwards to assert that he had neglected to save his brother's life when it was in his power to do so; nay, some even charged him with having contributed to his condemnation. This imputation his friends have indignantly repelled. They maintain that, on the contrary, it was chiefly through his influence that André had remained unmolested for the sixteen months preceding. They affirm, moreover, that Joseph had been for some time virtually disconnected with the Jaco-

bins, having grown wiser as they grew more frantic; that he was then a suspected if not a denounced man, and would himself have shared the fate of André, had the rule of Robespierre lasted a fortnight longer. The two pleas are not perfectly consistent, and we think that generally the editors and biographers of the brothers have erred in trying to prove too much, and in giving to the accusation a greater importance than it deserved.* For our own part, we do not believe one syllable of it. The Chéniers had that strong family attachment which all families ought to have, and it is absurd to suppose that if Joseph regarded the wishes of his relatives, when the question was only about breaking off a paper war with his brother, he would have disregarded them when that brother's life was at stake. The advice he gave his father, who wished him to agitate openly for his brothers, "Rather try to let them be forgotten," was the very best that could have been given, as the event too truly showed. Had nothing been said about André, he might have remained unnoticed for *two days longer*, which would have been enough to save his life, and actually did save the life of Sauveur; but the memorial which his father addressed to that body called with a mournful irony *the Committee of Public Safety*, was his death-warrant.*

And now comes a characteristic specimen of radical inaccuracy. Another of the Chéniers, Sauveur, formerly an officer in the army of the north, had been arrested and imprisoned at Beauvais. In such haste was the indictment against André drawn up, that it confounded him with Sauveur; attributed to one brother the acts and writings of both, and designated

* Especially do we think M. Arnault to blame, for seriously confuting, in a narration of two pages, a scandalous story of Madame de Genlis, about Mademoiselle Dumesnil's reception of Joseph Chénier; as if a French actress would trouble herself about *truth*, when there was a chance of saying a *mot*, or making a scene.

† And yet, after all, must we not say that, in a higher sense, Joseph Chénier was morally guilty of his brother's death? He had encouraged the Jacobins in their earlier attempts; he had defended or apologized for their excesses; he had given them his pen, his voice, and his influence. In so far, then, as he had contributed to their triumph, must he be deemed answerable for the consequences of that triumph. Alas! it is not too well remembered even at the present day, that *they who help to open the flood-gates, are responsible for the inundation*.



the poet-editor as ex-adjutant-general and chief of brigade, under Dumouriez! One of Andre's eulogists suggests that he made no allusion to this palpable flaw, in hopes that this confusion of personal identity might be the means of saving his brother. If so, his silence was successful.

There were, indeed, many reasons why Andre Chenier should have made no further opposition to the proceedings against him, than was necessary to expose their injustice and illegality in the eyes of future generations. To one whose patriotic hopes had been so cruelly disappointed, life was of little value. When a man of refined education, liberal principles, hopes of liberal institutions, and freedom from party fanaticism, sees all constitutional landmarks swept away, and the ochlocracy triumphant, his despondency is utter and hopeless. He has "lost the dream of doing and the other dream of done," and knows not how to help himself or others. In one case only can he be sustained. If his mind has been deeply imbued with the true philosophy—the philosophy of Christianity—he may remember that "God

fulfils himself in many ways," and faith will illumine for him what, to the eye of reason alone, is thick darkness.

θάρσει μοι θάρσει τέκνον,
μέγας ἔστι ἐν οὐρανῷ Ζεὺς
ὅς τ' αὖθ' ἐφορα καὶ κρατύνει.

But we very much fear Chenier had not this consolation. His views, lofty and noble as they were, were still bounded by this world and the limits of human ability. And at that time it seemed as if no human ability could do anything for the French. The people, from whom the gallows was a more acceptable gift than the right hand of friendship,* had triumphed, and he had long before made up his mind which alternative to choose.

Chenier was guillotined July 25th, 1794. His works were not collected till 1819, and complete editions of them did not appear till 1840.

* "S'ils triomphent, ce sont gens par qui il vaut mieux être pendre que regarder comme ami."—*Avis aux Français sur leurs véritables Ennemis.*

FREDERICK WILLIAM IV. KING OF PRUSSIA.

[The accompanying portrait of the present King of Prussia, was taken from an excellent German print, furnished for the purpose, by the politeness of J. W. Schmidt, Esq., Prussian Consul for this city. It is a pen drawing, printed by Donlevy's Chemotypic press.—Ed.]

FREDERICK WILLIAM the Fourth was born in the royal palace, at Berlin, on the 15th of October, in the year 1795. His father was then Crown Prince of Prussia, for his grandfather, Frederick William II., was still on the throne.

It must be confessed, that this monarch came into existence in one of the most stormy periods that mark the history of our world. The great French Revolution was well advanced in its wonderful career. Like a tornado, it had swept over France,

burying in ruin the ancient house of the Capets, and all the time-honored institutions of the Church and of the State. All the old orders of society, all the former usages and opinions, all the cherished modes of administering the government, and even the very boasted military tactics of the age of Louis the Great, (as Louis XIV. had long been called,) had gone down together in the overwhelming vortex of that astounding movement; and a new social and political world was beginning to

rise out of the chaos. The Directory had succeeded the overthrow of Robespierre and his Jacobin friends; and it was preparing the way for its own dissolution, and the accession of the Consulate, with the Corsican at its head.

Nor had the moral volcano, which had levelled every ancient institution of France in the dust—just as the tremendous hurricane in the natural world, prostrates forests, overturns houses, and spreads desolation everywhere—been confined, in its ravages, to the limits of that beautiful, but then unhappy country. Its effects were felt in all the civilized world, especially in the European portion of it. Thrones which had endured a thousand years, trembled on their bases, and fear fell upon all the venerable adjuncts by which they had been so long propped up.

In no country was there more alarm among sensible and far-seeing men, than in Germany: in none was there greater occasion for it. From immemorial time—at least from the downfall of the Roman empire—that country had been the prey of all sorts of despotism, from that of the poorest baron and the humblest priest, up through the double lines of State and Church, to the throne of the Emperor and the chair of the Fisherman.

Yet, strange as it may seem to men of our day, the trembling despotisms of that country—wholly insensible of their own weakness, and ignorant of the nation with which they had to do—combined their forces, for the purpose of reducing France to her pristine condition. Large armies were marched to the Rhine, there to meet inglorious defeat, and thence to be driven back, overwhelmed with shame, to the lands whence they came.

Nor is it wonderful that they suffered such disasters. The enemy with whom they went to contend, was a young giant, awaking up in all his energy, and intoxicated with the enthusiasm of newly-gotten freedom. The sudden acquisition on the part of the masses of liberty, or what was deemed to be such, had infused a new life throughout the entire nation. Old things had passed away, and all things had become new—alas! not always in the best sense. And when the old dynasties undertook to put down this most astonishing movement which the world has ever seen,

the *Allons!* and the *Marchons!* of the Marseillaise Hymn sent young France in overwhelming force into Flanders, to the Rhine, to the Jura, to the Alps. No hostile foot was allowed to tread the soil of France many days. The panic-stricken foe was pursued even into the marshes of Holland, nor found, in its dykes and its canals, the safety which it sought. Not only did the blue-eyed Germans retreat with precipitation back to the eastern bank of the Rhine, but were glad to surrender the western, and with it, four millions of inhabitants, to the Republic of France. The Austrians were chased out of Switzerland, and were compelled to retire altogether from their ill-gotten possessions in Italy! Such were the achievements of a mighty nation, when freedom had infused a new life throughout all the classes of its population.

And what if liberty was perverted to licentiousness, and new despots mounted to the deserted seats whence the old had so recently been hurled? Still the people possessed the emblems and some of the substantial fruits of freedom. Old monopolies were gone. The enormous landed possessions of the church, of the nobility, and of the crown, had been, for the most part, confiscated, and a new order of things, so far as the agricultural population was concerned, had commenced. And if despotism had again taken the place of liberty, even while wearing its garb, it was some consolation to the masses, that the despots were from among themselves, and not of an ancient, privileged, and long-detested caste. And then, if it was a despotism, it was a *glorious* one, which to Frenchmen is a great deal. What if it gave them chains at home? it gave them consideration and glory abroad. Still more, if it was a despotism, it was one of their own making; and we all know that men will submit with much more contentment and better grace, to burthens of which they themselves are the authors, than to those which others impose on them.

But let us return from this digression—a digression, however, needed to illustrate the subject—to the state of Germany at the epoch of the birth of Frederick William IV. Two great military governments ruled the Germanic and Germano-Slavonic races—the Austrian and Prussian

Both had attained to an acmé of hauteur, at once insupportable and ridiculous, on account of their achievements in arms. But the grounds of this insolent bearing were not equal. Austria had for a long period been distinguished for her warlike propensities and illustrious deeds. She had met the Turks in a hundred battles, and, aided by Poland, had been the bulwark of Christendom against the Moslems. She had often measured her strength with the Gallic race, and not without success. She had, therefore, something like an ancient greatness in military affairs, and her renown was world-wide extended.

As to Prussia, she was a *parvenu* among the great powers, not having, in fact, completed a century of national existence.* She had been singularly fortunate in the main, in her rulers; no royal house in Europe having, from the first, produced more great men than that of Brandenburg. But Prussia is, for the most part, a poor country, and originally its extent was very limited.† Its position, too, is one of essential and innate weakness. But Frederick the Great, whose equal in military talent has seldom been seen, either in ancient or modern times, had raised her up from the condition of a third or fourth-rate power, to a place in the very first rank. In his Seven Years' War, he resisted, successfully, Russia, Austria, France, Poland and Sweden, together with several of the smaller powers of Germany. Indeed, at

one time, it seemed as if he should be compelled to stand against all continental Europe. And what a spectacle did he present! At one moment, we see him beating the Russians on the Oder, and driving them back towards Poland; anon he is fighting the Austrians amid the mountains of Silesia, or attacking and battering down the battlements of Prague! At one while, all seems to be lost! The enemy takes possession of his blazing capital, whilst he flies with his shattered legions to the banks of the Elbe. But soon victory perches again on his standards, and "Old Fritz" is in possession of his sandy, pine-producing realm. Nothing could daunt him. He might be beaten, but conquered, never. His mind was as active as his body, and his right hand wielded the goose-quill as readily as the sword. For him to write "two hundred verses" on the eve of a great battle, was almost an ordinary night's work!

That such a consummate general, the monarch of the nation, should be surrounded with able commanders, is no way astonishing. Himself sharing in all the fatigues and exposures of the camp—with as much patience drilling a company of grenadiers, on foot, in the midst of a drenching rain, as he marshalled a hundred regiments on a *Champ de Mars*—it was inevitable that his spirit should be imparted to the officers around him, be they princes of the blood, nobles of high birth, or plebeians from the lowest ranks. The same enthusiasm pervaded the non-commissioned officers and common soldiers. And at his death he left Prussia the most distinguished nation in Europe for military prowess. He left, too, an able corps of great commanders, whom his own genius and example had trained up. And Prussian tactics were adopted, as the French are now, by all the civilized world, and the plans of her campaigns and of her battles were studied, as master-pieces, by cadets and all others who sought distinction in military life.

In the year 1786, died Frederick the Great, and with him the military glory of Prussia went down to the tomb, and remained there for a quarter of a century. Frederick William II. succeeded to the throne of his illustrious uncle, and ingloriously reigned till the year 1797. Neither the nation nor the world had very elevated

* The national existence of Prussia dates from January, 1701, when Frederick III., Duke of Brandenburg, assumed the title of King of Prussia, and the name of Frederick I. of that kingdom.

† Frederick William—the *Great Elector*, as he is commonly called—was the real founder of the Prussian kingdom. He came to the ducal throne of Brandenburg in 1640, and reigned more than forty years. He was in every sense a great man, and a decided Protestant. He invited the persecuted Huguenots of France to his dominions, and thousands flocked thither, carrying with them their industry—not to say their riches—as well as their piety. He was the father of the first King of Prussia, referred to in the preceding note.

At the commencement, Prussia was a very small kingdom. Even when Frederick II. (commonly called Frederick the Great) ascended the throne in 1740, Prussia was not larger in extent than the State of Pennsylvania, and its population was about three millions! He left it greatly enlarged and quite powerful. At present, Prussia exceeds 120,000 square miles, and has about fifteen millions of inhabitants. Its disjointed state, as well as its natural position, is a great obstacle in the way of its being a very strong country. For its defence it must emphatically depend, under God, on the wisdom and valor of its inhabitants.

expectations of his distinguishing himself. It augured anything else than greatness, that "Old Fritz" had driven him in his younger years from the army, telling him to go home and take care of his children! And most certainly and amply did his life and actions establish the correctness of the great warrior's opinion. The best thing that can be said of his reign is, that it was one of peace. But it was one of wasteful extravagance and mal-administration. A large army was maintained in idleness, corrupting, by its relaxed discipline and dissolute manners, the moral atmosphere, far and wide, wherever any portion of it was stationed. Nothing could exceed the pride and audaciousness of the officers, especially those of the lower grades. Every one thought himself the heir of all the military capacity and glory of the "Great Frederick." He who had served with the renowned Captain, in whatever rank, deemed himself invincible! And when, in the early part of the French Revolution, the Prussian troops met with some pretty serious defeats (though they gained some victories) on the Rhine, their disasters seem not to have opened their eyes to the possibility, either that they had lost any of the prowess which they had acquired under Frederick the Great, or that their enemies had made any advances upon the tactics and the discipline of a by-gone generation. Nothing of the sort seems to have entered their heads.

They heard, indeed, with some degree of astonishment, of the victories of the French in Flanders, on the Rhine, under their Republican generals, Dumouriez, Jourdan, Bernadotte, Moreau, and others, and especially those of Napoleon in the north of Italy. But they attributed them to the inferiority of their antagonists. Even the victories of Marengo and of Austerlitz, at later epochs, scarcely agitated their self-complacency, or made them believe it possible that similar reverses might await them in their turn. "They have beaten the Austrians, but they have not met the Prussians!" "Let Prussia," said they, "but once enter the lists with France, and the superiority of her *high-born* officers, of the school of Frederick the Great, over the French bourgeois troops, will soon appear."

Nothing could exceed the arrogance of the Prussian officers, save their contempt for the French. And yet, to the eye of

the reflecting, nothing could be more discouraging. The officers who had served under the great Frederick, were mostly old and infirm men: some were afflicted with the gout, and others were unfit for service from other causes. Among the younger officers, infidelity and immorality extensively prevailed, as, alas! too generally in the nation at large. The common soldiers were ignorant, and treated too much like machines, or like beasts. There was no *morale* among either officers or men. Among the former the *prestige* of the great Frederick and his victories, was almost the only stimulus that was effective to wake up their courage. Among the latter, there was little enthusiasm in behalf of any cause. A blind, unreasoning obedience was all that was expected of either officers or soldiers. Count Henkel says, in his "Memoirs," that when Frederick William II. died, the colonel of the regiment to which he belonged assembled his men, and made them this remarkable speech:—

"His Majesty Frederick William II. has been pleased to die. We have therefore to swear allegiance to a new king. What his name will be, whether Frederick William, or Frederick, we cannot exactly tell; but that does not signify. Herr Gerichtschreiber, read the oath aloud."

In the year 1797, Frederick William III. ascended a throne environed by many trials. Napoleon was conquering everything before him in the north of Italy, and preparing to enact the part of another Alexander of Macedon. The King was still young. Conscious of the many difficulties which beset his path, and distrustful of his own capacity to meet the storm, which he soon saw was approaching, he was disposed to act with a caution that bordered on timidity. But he was surrounded by rash counselors, who clamored for war with France. War with France was more and more earnestly demanded by a large party every year. At the head of this party was the King's cousin, Louis Ferdinand, a man of great influence among the younger officers, and of vast popularity with the people.

At length, after years of very complex, and it must be confessed, of very doubtful diplomatic manœuvring, in which her character for wisdom, not to say justice,

suffered greatly, Prussia declared war against France. Soon a vast army was in motion on the southern borders of her kingdom, under the command of the old Duke of Brunswick, to meet the enemy. Great was the vaunting of the officers and courtiers. A major boasted "that he would make that scoundrel, Bonaparte, his groom." Every one, save the serious and reflecting men who had long remarked and deplored the degeneracy of the times, was sanguine of success. Alas! in this, as in too many other instances, achievement did not equal promise. The declaration of war was made on the 6th day of October, 1806; on the 14th, Bonaparte, with his irresistible forces, scattered the Prussians, as the chaff is driven by the wind, on the plains of Jena. On that fatal day perished both the prestige of the name of the great Frederick, and their wretched self-delusion. In a few days Napoleon was at their capital, occupying, if not revelling in, the deserted palaces of Frederick William III. The forces of the Prince of Ponte Corvo, (Bernadotte,) Soult and Murat drove a large Prussian army westward to Lübeck, and compelled them to lay down their arms, on the other side of that city, near the Danish frontier. Whilst Bonaparte, with the main body of his army, pursued the flying forces of the King eastward into Poland and Eastern Prussia, where the battles of Pultusk, Ostrolenka, Eylau, and Friedland, led to the treaty of Tilsit, and the utter prostration—not to say annihilation—of the Prussian kingdom. The foot of the conqueror was even on the neck of the fallen and wretched foe.

Six long years of disgrace, distress, and deep humiliation, ensued. The sufferings which Prussia endured—the insults heaped upon the men, and the cruel injuries done to the women—have never been fully revealed to the world.* But these years of

affliction were profitable in the way of discipline. They led the good to seek help where only it could be found, in God. The

their former wars with Austria, Poland, Russia, Saxony and Sweden. The retributive justice of God in the affairs of men is certain, and often wonderfully signal. The chalice which we commend to other lips will, sooner or later, be commended to our own.

The insolence of Napoleon towards the fallen royal house of Prussia, is well known. Neither the sex nor the beauty of the Queen, who was one of the loveliest of women, and who died of a broken heart, occasioned by the calamities of her country, could protect her against his base calumnies. On his way to St. Helena, and during the years of his confinement on that rock, he lost no opportunity of insulting the memory of that excellent woman—a conduct unworthy of a truly great man. Neither Scipio, nor Gustavus Adolphus, nor our own Washington, could have been guilty of such ineffable baseness.

That he should indulge his jeers and taunts against the King, was to be expected, considering the contempt in which he held him—a contempt which was shared by almost every other sovereign of the old dynasties of that day. One of the most amusing instances of this sort, of which we have any knowledge, we heard from the lips of Sir Robert Wilson, at present the military Governor of Gibraltar. That wonderful man, whose own "Memoirs" would make one of the most entertaining books in the world, was several times sent by the British Government as "Military Commissioner," to attend the allied armies in their wars against Napoleon. In this capacity he was present in the campaign of the winter of 1806-7, in Poland and Eastern Prussia, and witnessed, we believe, the battle of Friedland. He was with the allied forces, in the same capacity, in the campaign of 1813, and saw the battle of Dresden, and that of Leipsic. He was very intimate with the late King of Prussia, and the Emperor Alexander, and ventured to accompany them to Tilsit, in the incognito of a Cossack officer. Bonaparte soon learned that he was there, and raved furiously one day at his own table, when those monarchs were his guests, declaring that he would hang Wilson, if he should catch him. The Emperor Alexander contrived to send a note to General Wilson, to apprise him of his danger, and to beseech him to fly. The Englishman immediately set out to quit the place, and on his way, with great sangfroid, passed by Bonaparte's quarters, leaning on the arm of General Worontzoff. Bonaparte, who was standing by the window, seeing him, asked the Emperor Alexander who it was that was walking with Worontzoff? He replied that it was a Cossack officer. The King of Prussia remarking that the countenance of Napoleon indicated both suspicion and vengeance, retired as soon as he could, and hastening down to the ferry, arrived just in time to see Wilson off. A moment only was spent in the King's relating to him what Bonaparte had said, and in giving him some instances of Napoleon's insolence to him and the Queen. *Inter alia*, he said, "To-day, at the dinner, at his own table, Bonaparte, remarking the rows of buttons on my pantaloons, (which studded the outer seams, from top to bottom, by way of ornament,) asked me, 'whether it required more time to button them from top to bottom, than from bottom to top?' The insolent and unmannerly fellow!" But Bonaparte cared very little about manners when he wished to insult a fallen foe, or an unyielding friend.

Among the most interesting of the works referred to at the head of this note, we may mention those written by Count Henkel, Karl Immerman, Profes-

* Within the last few years many works, relating to this period of Prussia's humiliation, have appeared in Germany, very few of which are known, even by title, to our American public. Many of these works are in the shape of "Memoirs" and "Records," and are more or less personal. They contain, however, very many facts of a national character, and they are deeply interesting as giving an insight into the state of things during that gloomy period. They contain details of the infamous conduct of the French officers and soldiers, which are truly appalling. It is probable, however, that the rapacity and violence of the French did not much exceed those of the Prussians themselves in

excellent King shared deeply in this conviction. A happy reaction took place; the plague of infidelity and irreligion was stayed; and a regenerating process commenced, affecting alike the court, the army and the nation. A deep sense of disgrace, combined with the indignation which injustice and oppression engendered, inflamed every heart, from the monarch on the throne, to the humblest peasant. The smothered fires gained strength year by year, until, when the proper time had come—the fatal year, to Napoleon, of 1813—it burst forth like a volcano, and overwhelming the French, drove them out of Germany.

To say that Prussia lost everything at Jena, would be to utter what all the world has said these forty years past. To say that that defeat saved her, (by leading her in what was probably the only practicable way of regeneration,) is a paradox in which there is a pregnant meaning. Another paradox has also been uttered respecting that same disastrous battle, namely, that Frederick the Great (by the blind and vain reliance of the Prussians on his name) was the cause of it.

Frederick William IV. was eleven years old when the battle of Jena was fought and his country ruined; and he was eighteen when the dreadful battle of Leipsic was fought, and the day of deliverance was come for down-trodden Prussia. And terribly was she avenged of her great enemy there, as well as at many other places, and among them the plains of Waterloo. Awaking from long years of oppression and anguish, she drove that enemy from her borders, nor ceased from the pursuit, until she saw him humbled in the dust. What a lesson of warning to the oppressor, and of hope to the oppressed, does her history teach!

In the month of May, 1840, died Frederick William III. at his palace in Berlin. The first half of his reign was eminently

disastrous in many respects, but the last fifteen years were peaceful, prosperous, and in the main happy. Gradually the kingdom recruited its resources and its energies; its population has steadily increased; and its proper influence in the European family of nations has been recovered. The reign of the late King, however gloomy the times during the former portion of it, secured many blessings to the people. A number of important ameliorations in the administration of its affairs were effected. It is indebted to that monarch for the existence of two of its best universities—those of Berlin and Bonn*—and for the renovation of the rest. Above all, it owes to his wisdom and fostering care, both the existence and the high degree of perfection of its admirable School System, which has secured the admiration and the imitation of all the German States, France, and several other countries.

It is true, that the nation were not well satisfied in regard to several subjects. In the first place, the King had promised, in 1815, to give his people a Constitution adapted to the demands of the age. Instead of this, he only restored provincial assemblies to those of the eight provinces of the realm which formerly had them, and created them in those which never had them. That these provincial assemblies, which are entirely consultative bodies, have been of use in directing the government, and in preparing the way for a constitutional government for the entire kingdom, cannot be denied; but they were far from fulfilling the expectations excited by the royal promise.

In the next place, the government sympathized entirely too much with Austria and Russia, in their abhorrence of everything like political agitation. In consequence of this, many young men of the universities, as well as other suspected persons, were made to undergo severe punishments in the shape of imprisonment, fines, banishment, &c., which were alike excessive, unjust, and impolitic.

Again, the army was kept on a footing entirely too large for a nation not abounding in wealth, and having scarcely 14,000,000

see Steffens, Ernest Moritz Arndt, Johannes Gustavus Droysen, Chamisso, and Varnhagen Von Ense—the last named of which has been translated into English, by Sir Alexander Duff Gordon, and was published in London, in 2 vols. 8vo., last year. This is a work full of interesting facts. The *Was ich erlebte* of Professor Steffens is even more interesting: it is quite voluminous, however, and has not been translated into English, so far as we know. Almost all these works have appeared within the last seven years.

* The University of Berlin was founded in 1809; that of Bonn in 1818.

of inhabitants. Indeed, the government was altogether too military in its spirit and character. By consequence, the burthens of the nation were very heavy.

Carried away by the desire of uniting the Lutheran and Reformed, or Calvinistic, Churches of his realm, in one "Evangelical Church," as it was called, he allowed measures to be employed to coerce the reluctant and the conscientiously opposed, which led to a grievous persecution, especially in Silesia.*

But whatever were the disappointments and grievances of the Prussians, they bore them patiently; for they entertained a heartfelt respect for Frederick William III. The belief was universal, that he was an honest and good man, who loved his people, and sincerely aimed at promoting his country's welfare. In that extreme simplicity of heart, for which the Germans are distinguished, the masses were ever ready to put the best construction on everything. When they heard of an instance of injustice on the part of the government officers, the common remark, especially among the peasants was, we are told, "Well, our good old Frederick knows nothing of this." They had sympathized with him, and he with them, in the great calamities which befell the nation, and which fell upon all—King as well as people;—and though they may never have esteemed him a great and capable prince, they believed him to be, what he eminently was, a good man.†

* Judging from the well-known character of Frederick William III., we should come to the conclusion, that his ministers and other men of influence about him, were often much more to blame than he, in regard to many of the unjust things done under his government. We are quite sure that some of these men greatly abused the influence which they had with him. In particular, we believe that the cruel persecution of the Lutherans in Silesia, who could not be induced to come into the Union of the Churches on the royal basis, was greatly owing to false representations and bad counsel given him by his favorite chaplain, or court-preacher, Dr. Strauss—not to be confounded with the heresiarch of the same name. It is well known that Dr. S. was a vile flatterer of his late majesty, and a great enemy to all dissent. He is still alive. We hope the present King will be on his guard against him.

† Frederick William III. was a man of great purity of life, which is the more remarkable, inasmuch as he grew up in the midst of a court which was very dissolute, and among a people amid whom the foundations of virtue had been widely and deeply undermined by the principles of the Voltairian philosophy—which is only a euphonious and polite name for Infidelity. He loved his beautiful Queen, Louisa, (a princess of Mecklenburg Strelitz,) whom he married in 1793, and who died of

Reader! wilt thou pardon this long introduction to our subject—the life and character of Frederick William IV., the present King of Prussia? If thou wilt, we promise thee to enter at once upon it.

The youth and early manhood of this monarch, as has been seen, were passed amid scenes of painfully surpassing interest. At a very early age, he, with two of his younger brothers, William and Frederick, entered the military service of the country, and was present in several severe battles, and displayed great enthusiasm and courage in behalf of its prostrated interests and its bleeding honor. The great battle of Leipsic, in the autumn of 1813, may be said to have terminated the domination of the French in the north of Germany, for the fortresses remaining in their hands were surrendered a few weeks later. But it was not until the battle of Waterloo had occurred, that the drama of the first Revolution of France terminated, and Germany and the world were forever delivered from the ambition and the arms of Napoleon. At this epoch Frederick William IV. was well advanced in his 20th year, and although he then felt that he might put off his arms—the exigency which had required their assumption having passed away—yet the spirit which the times had created has not even yet ceased to manifest itself in fondness for military display and the maintenance of a large military establishment, which makes a very heavy draft annually on the treasury of the nation.

From 1815 to 1840 Frederick William enjoyed a long period of comparative leisure for the improvement of his mind and the enjoyment of domestic happiness, which it has been his good fortune to share to an extent which rarely falls to the lot of a prince, especially of one who is

grief for the losses of her country in 1810. She bore him four sons and three daughters, all of whom, we believe, still live. In the charming forest in the rear of the palace of Charlottenburg, some four miles distant from Berlin, he erected a small but appropriate mausoleum for her remains. On her tomb lies the exquisite statue which the sculptor Rauch made of purest marble. Nothing can exceed the sweet dignity of the countenance, and great propriety of drapery, which the artist has compelled the marble to express. The King was in the habit, when staying at Charlottenburg—which was often—of visiting this tomb daily, and was ever observed to "come out wiping the tears from his eyes."

heir to a throne. The leisure which he enjoyed, however, was but comparative; for being the *Crown Prince*, as the heir-apparent is called in Germany and other Teutonic countries, he had to take more or less interest in the affairs of the government, and bear more or less of its burthens. This was more especially true of all that concerned the military department. Standing as near as he did to the throne, it was not proper for him to quit the country for any considerable periods. He visited, however, from time to time, the chief countries of Europe. With Germany he became familiar by travel. He visited Italy, France, Holland, England, Denmark, Russia, &c. To Holland and Russia he often went, having a sister married in each—in the former to Prince Frederick, brother of the present King of that country, and in the latter to the Emperor. Of the institutions of England, and even of English literature, he has a considerable acquaintance.

At a proper age he married a Bavarian princess, with whom he has lived many and happy years.* To the great regret of the nation, they have no children. Of course his next brother, William, is heir to the throne. The Queen was a Roman Catholic at the time of her marriage. In the course of a year or two she became a Protestant. Her conversion to the Protestant faith was an event which gave not only her husband, but also her father-in-law, great joy. For whatever may be said of both, a want of attachment to the Protestant Religion can never with truth be charged upon either. It is the testimony of all, that her Majesty is a woman of the loveliest and purest character. Often as we have been in Prussia, we have never heard a word respecting her save what was to her praise. She is a pattern in unaffected goodness, and feminine grace

and propriety of deportment, to her female subjects. It is said, by those who have means for forming a correct opinion, that she is sincerely pious. Her influence over her royal spouse has, we have reason to believe, been eminently happy.

That Frederick William IV. employed well the long period which he lived as Crown Prince, we have been assured by men who are well qualified to speak on the subject. The celebrated Baron Alexander Humboldt, the veteran traveller, himself a prince of the first rank in the scientific world, has been one of the most intimate friends of the King from his (the King's) youth. He was the intimate friend of the late King. From the lips of this distinguished man—an authority which few will be disposed to question*—we have ourselves heard the statement which we are about to give, namely: That the King received a private education from teachers who were employed in the palace for that purpose—a fact which he has never ceased to deplore. It was his wish to go to the university, and receive such an education as other young men, his equals in age, received there. But his father thought this inconsistent with the dignity of his birth and position in life. By great diligence he has, however, made himself a well-informed man. Baron Humboldt thinks that there is no monarch in Europe superior to him in acquired knowledge, and styles him a "*self-made man*." In order to secure his own improvement, the King, whilst he was Crown Prince, (as he has done since he ascended the throne,) surrounded himself with literary and well-informed men, from whose conversation, and even direct instructions, he has reaped immense advantages. We know not how many other modern languages he speaks, but we know that besides the German, his mother tongue, he *speaks* both French and English well, and *writes* the former (and probably the latter, although we cannot affirm this) with great beauty and facility. His intimate friends—his bosom

* We think it would be difficult to find a couple, whether in the ranks of princes or of untitled people, who enjoy greater domestic happiness than Frederick William IV. and his Queen. Beautiful, accomplished, and amiable, it is not wonderful that she secured from their earliest acquaintance his warmest affection. No one can be with them alone without being struck with the unaffected and sincere esteem and love which they entertain for each other. We have ourselves witnessed this, and have repeatedly heard the King address the Queen as his "*Chère Elise*:" her baptismal name is Elizabeth.

* Nevertheless we have heard this authority called in question, and by whom do you think, dear reader? By an ignorant German quack, who came among us, not from Prussia, but from an obscure duchy in Germany, and who probably never was in Prussia at all. The reader may decide for himself which to believe—Alexander Humboldt or an illegitimate son of *Æsculapius*!

friends, if we may so speak—during the period when he was Crown Prince, were (and they still are) Humboldt, Bunsen, Von Gerlach, (the General,) Von Græben, (the General and Count,) Von Arnim, and others of similar character; and if a man, be he prince or otherwise, is to be judged of by the company he keeps, as the old adage asserts, we think that Frederick William IV. is fairly entitled to the favorable opinion of mankind. But let this pass for what it is worth. The statement we have just made is true to the letter.

In his younger years Frederick William IV. displayed some traits of character which gave no little uneasiness to his friends, and which, in fact, made him not a few enemies. There was a certain hauteur in his manners that was offensive. His temper was quick, excitable, irritable even, and impatient. Withal, being a man of great wit and humor, he indulged too often in its use, and even sometimes in sarcasm—very dangerous weapons, whether in the hands of prince or common man. Time, and the good advice of his friends, especially the influence of the best of all his friends, his beloved Queen,* have done much to overcome these infirmities and perversities of character. Still, we apprehend that there is need of further attention to this portion of the field of self-culture. Impatience, precipitation, and consequently rashness, are evils to which we are inclined to think his Majesty is peculiarly exposed.

At length, his father having gone down to the tomb, Frederick William IV. was

* We have heard many anecdotes at Berlin, respecting the Queen's happy influence over her royal consort, some of them, doubtless, apocryphal enough. The following is, we have reason to believe, true; at any rate it is beautiful. The Queen early remarking the defects in the King's character referred to, endeavored to correct them, telling him that he should try to control his temper better, &c. But he used to say laughingly, "Oh, I'll do better when I become King." But she replied, "You ought to get the victory over your passions while you are a prince." It so happened that soon after he had ascended the throne, the Queen overheard him one day, talking boisterously with one of the ministers of his father, with whom he was probably displeased. Tremblingly alive to the honor of her husband, she ventured to go into the room where he and the minister were, and without taking any notice of them, she walked towards a window, apparently looking for something. The King hastened to her, and said, "My dear, what are you looking for?" She replied in a low tone, "I am looking for the King!" He understood the hint, and accompanying her to the door, thanked her for her kindness, and governed his temper better during the rest of the interview with the minister.

called to ascend the throne of Prussia, (on the 7th of June, 1840,) in the 45th year of his age, and in the vigor of his strength. There were some things connected with the double event—the death of the father and the accession of the son—which were very touching. The King was from his youth distinguished for filial piety, and ever entertained for his father the greatest reverence. He was constantly with him in his last sickness, which was a painful and protracted one. Vast multitudes assembled in front of the palace when they heard that the old King was dying; and when his death was announced, they waited in silence for the new King to show himself on the elevated steps. This he did with great difficulty, being overcome with emotion.* All he could do was to bow in grateful acknowledgment to the multitude when they saluted him as their King, and cried out, "God save the King." In a few days the oath of allegiance was administered in his presence, to all the great officers of state. When this was done, he came forward, of his own accord, and in the presence of a vast multitude, he swore with uplifted hand, that he would govern the kingdom according to the principles of truth and righteousness, so far as he could ascertain them.†

No sooner was Frederick William IV. seated on the throne of his fathers, than he set about the discharge of the important duties devolved upon him. Seven years and more have now passed away, during which he has been unremittingly occupied with the cares of his office. They have been seven eventful years, during which seeds have been sown that will bring forth a great harvest—whether of good or of evil remains to be seen—both in the Church

* We have been told on good authority that he not only called on his pious friends who were immediately around him, and especially his excellent wife, "to pray for him," saying "that he never needed their prayers so much in his life," but that he also wrote to an ambassador of his kingdom, in whose religious character he had great confidence, a very little time after his father's death, to this effect: "My dear —, my father has just deceased, and I am going to ascend the throne! Pray for me, O pray for me, that God would give me the grace and wisdom I need to enable me to govern this people aright."

† This ceremony may be considered as taking the place of the formal coronation which prevails in other monarchies of Europe; for the Kings of Prussia are never crowned. This is a remarkable exception to a custom which has long prevailed in regal governments.

and State of Prussia. Shortly after the accession of Frederick William IV., such of his friends as were friends of peace, were not a little concerned lest he might get entangled in the difficulty between France and the other great powers, in relation to the "Eastern Question," as it was called. They were afraid lest his military propensities might carry him too far, in a moment of great excitement, when (in the month of October of that year, 1840) war appeared to be inevitable. But the threatening storm passed away, and Prussia and the rest of Europe repose in peace. And long may it continue!

The limits which we must assign to this notice of the life and character of Frederick William IV., will not permit us to speak of all the subjects of interest to which his mind has been directed, nor of all the measures of importance which have been adopted. The most we can do is to indicate such as are likely to have the greatest bearing upon the welfare of Prussia and Germany, if not upon the interests of humanity entire.

And, first, it is a pleasant task to record that the present King of Prussia has inherited the spirit which has prevailed so much in his illustrious house, in regard to the proper encouragement of institutions of learning. It was the chiefest glory of the reign of his father that he fostered seminaries of every class, for the diffusion of science, and of knowledge in all its branches. The present monarch has availed himself of every opportunity to enrich the six universities of his realm by attracting to them men of talents as professors. To accomplish this, no expense has been spared. The veteran philosopher Schelling was induced to leave Munich, and establish himself at Berlin, five or six years ago. To the same university the distinguished juriconsult, Stahl, was drawn from Erlangen, to deliver lectures on law. When the King of Hanover pursued such a course as drove several of the best professors from the University of Göttingen, the King of Prussia immediately offered them posts in the universities of his kingdom. He seems to delight in doing everything in his power to make Prussia, in learning and learned men, to Germany, what the republic of Athens was to Greece, or what Greece was to the rest of

the world.* Indeed, he has done almost too much in this way, for he has, as it were, impoverished some of the other parts of Germany. He has liberally encouraged the fine arts also, and drawn to his kingdom some excellent artists.†

But the subject of religion, or rather, the state of the churches in Prussia, is one which has greatly engrossed the King's thoughts ever since he came to the throne. We will endeavor to make this question clear to the reader. We begin with stating that the King is a decided Protestant, and holds with great earnestness what is called the evangelical system of doctrine; in other words, the doctrines held and taught by the Reformers. He has a great abhorrence of the rationalistic and pantheistic heresies, which have crept into the Protestant church so extensively, through a want of the proper maintenance of discipline on the part of those who should have guarded the sacred portals of the temple. He deems these errors to be fundamental, and utterly subversive, not only of the Gospel, but also of the foundations of all sound morality. And he is right. But how are these heresies to be expelled from the national Church of Prussia, where they have nestled for years? This is a very grave question, and hard to answer. His Majesty's project for doing this is as follows:—To give the church *autocracy*, or independence, and induce it to do the work of restoring purity of doctrine to all its branches.

To do this, he convoked a synod of some seventy-five or six members, a year ago last summer, at Berlin. With the exception of some ten or twelve individuals, this synod was composed of men of evangelical doctrines, more or less distinctly held and enunciated. To draw together such a synod would have been impossible, if the

* It is really delightful to go into the Royal Library of Berlin, which is also the University Library, and see the large collection of well-selected books which is there. We were assured by the keepers, when we were there a little more than a year ago, that it then contained 600,000 volumes, and is rapidly increasing. About \$40,000 are annually expended to maintain and enlarge this library.

† There are several very distinguished artists in Germany at this time. Rauch and Danneker are excellent sculptors. So is Steinhauer, of Bremen. There is an admirable group of his, Leander and Hero, in the royal palace at Berlin. It is a beautiful and exquisite affair.

choice of members had been left to the churches; for, of nearly eight thousand Protestant ministers in Prussia, the overwhelming majority have departed from the evangelical system, as the "faith that saves" is called. The Synod was, therefore, a *packed* one, in some sense, else so large a majority of evangelical delegates would not have been there.

When this body came together, the King informed them that he had convoked them to ask their advice on several very important subjects, saying, however, that he should not consider himself bound to follow their advice. At the same time, he exhorted them to be very careful as to what advice they gave him, for that he should be very likely to follow it. Among the subjects submitted to the consideration of the Synod was that of recommending a Confession of Faith for the National Church, whose hearty adoption should be required of all who would be pastors in it. The Synod recommended, in the main, that of Augsburg. Another subject was the nature, or rather the terms and extent, of the oath or subscription to be required of all candidates for the ministerial or pastoral office. This was a perplexing question. It was found difficult to get clear of a *quatenus**—that word which has opened the door to so much controversy, and what is worse, to so much heresy. At length the Synod decided on this point, and all others that were submitted to them, and the members returned home after a session of some three months.

It remains to be seen what the King will do. It is probable that, by this course, he will find a Confession of Faith which he will proclaim by edict to be that of the National Church, the Church supported by the government. By requiring an *ex animo* adoption of this symbol of doctrine, on the part of those who are, or who would be, pastors in that Church, and by giving at the same time a large measure of

religious liberty, or toleration rather, his Majesty may in time, by bringing all the patronage of the government to bear on the subject, restore external uniformity, and avowed purity of doctrine, to the National Church. The plan is far-reaching and well-contrived, but we doubt both its wisdom and its justice. Perhaps the King, in his laudable zeal for the renovation of the National Church, could do nothing better. But it savors too much of a wisdom that belongs to this world, rather than that which comes from above. When a good king undertakes to promote religion, or any other good thing, he is in great danger of doing too much.

For ourselves, we are inclined to think that the true way to bring about the regeneration of the fallen Protestant Churches on the Continent, which are all connected with the State, and have been corrupted by the unhallowed alliance, would be to dissolve that union, and throw them upon the voluntary support of the people. In that case, truth would have to depend on its own resources, under the blessing of its great Author, and must in the issue prevail; whilst error, inadequate to meet the demands of humanity, having no sufficiency in itself, and above all, no promise of heavenly succor to fall back upon, must fail in the struggle and yield the victory. We are quite sure that, although for a time religion might apparently lose ground, and great confusion occur, yet a pure Christianity—the Christianity of the apostolic ages, and such as the reformers strove to bring back to the world—must arise like a new creation, from a temporary chaos. The King of Prussia holds a different opinion on the subject, and hopes, in avoiding a "disruption," to work out the restoration of pure doctrine to a Church where it has so extensively been lost. Time, which resolves so many things now doubtful, will decide whether he has chosen the better course or not.

Another and very weighty subject has engaged much of the attention of Frederick William IV., from his accession to the throne to the present time, and will probably do so for years to come. It is that of giving a Constitution to his people. The nation, although they bore with extraordinary patience the non-fulfilment of the promise of the late King, were in

* The word *quatenus* is in fact a double one, and is composed of *quâ* *tenus*, and means "according to" or "as far as." It was introduced into the subscription to creeds when the person who made it engaged to receive the creed or confession in question, *as far as* it agreed (in his judgment) with the Sacred Scriptures. It is a word which has played no small part in the theological controversies in the Christian world, especially in Protestant countries.

great hopes that the present monarch would grant this boon, without delay, upon his ascending the throne. It is understood that such hopes were encouraged by royal declarations. Several years, however, passed away before anything was done, and that "deferred hope" which "makes the heart sick," began to be deeply felt throughout Prussia. What the cause of this procrastination may have been, the world has not been informed. Perhaps it was opposition from the King's own family, or his cabinet, both of which, it is believed, were at first, and for a long time, against the project. Perhaps it was opposition from abroad; for it is not likely that Austria, to say nothing of Russia, could have heard, without alarm and remonstrance, even the rumor of the intended royal gift. And it is well known that Wurtemberg, and some other petty German kingdoms and principalities, were greatly concerned, and decidedly opposed to the proposition. But it is most likely that the delay was occasioned by the difficulty which the King experienced in his attempts to devise a constitution which would satisfy his own views of what was needed. Nor is this wonderful. Of all handiwork to which a monarch might be set, we are inclined to think that Constitution-making would be precisely that at which he would be found most awkward.

But whatever were the causes of the adjournment of this matter, it was at last announced to the world—if not with a heraldic flourish of trumpets, at least with extensive out-givings by the press and in conversation—that the long-expected constitution would soon be forthcoming. Accordingly, on the 11th of April last, all the eight provincial assemblies were convoked in Berlin, to constitute a general Diet of the kingdom, to which the Constitution was to be submitted. This body, when convened, was found to number more than eight hundred members,—nobles, burgesses, and peasants—for the three classes of the inhabitants are represented in the provincial assemblies. We are inclined to think that his Majesty committed a serious blunder in calling together so large a body, composed of men elected for a purpose altogether different. But perhaps he could choose none more suitable;

and, as to the number, he may have found it difficult to make a selection.

The day appointed for opening the Diet was the Sabbath, because the King thought that the serious work to be done befitted the sacred day; nor were due religious observances wanting. On this occasion, his Majesty made a long speech, (he is a fine speaker, and may be fairly styled the orator-king of our times,) in which he endeavored to set forth his views of the subject. What those views were on all points, it is not very easy to gather from the translations of the royal speech which we find in the English and French papers. One thing, however, is not very doubtful—it is, that the King had no idea of giving what we should call a complete constitution, well defined and sufficiently comprehensive—far from it. In fact, the submitted project was very much such an affair as the extorted concession of King John at Runnymede. With the exception of a considerable control over the national purse, it gave little or nothing to the Diet beyond the privilege of discussing, and giving advice on, such subjects as the government might submit to it!

It is easy to conceive that no little disappointment was felt in the Diet when the royal scheme was laid before it, and in the nation when they saw it set forth in the newspapers—although it must be confessed that expectation had not been very high.

The Diet, however, lost no time in proceeding with the work of organization, and then commenced the discussion of the subjects which were submitted to it in the royal address, as well as those which were from time to time laid before it by the minister whose duty it was to act as the organ of the government. A session of several weeks ensued, during which very many able and animated discussions took place, embracing a very wide range, and including often subjects on which the government had no desire whatever to learn the opinions of the Diet—such as the competency of the body to decide on the qualifications of its own members, &c. In these discussions a great deal of talent was elicited, as well as an unexpected display of capacity to grapple with the most difficult questions originated by the exigency. Several men of commanding intellect and eloquence were revealed, if we may so

speak, to the Diet, the nation, and the world—men whose names are now ringing throughout Germany.

At length the Diet, having gotten through the consideration of the subjects submitted to it, was dissolved, and its members returned to their homes, some of them to be received with ovations at the hands of their delighted constituents. And what now is going to be done? That is a very grave question, which, not being prophets, we do not feel ourselves capable of answering with confidence. We will, however, say a few words.

In the first place, we think that Frederick William has committed the serious mistake—through his great admiration of almost everything that concerns England—of believing that the true way to accomplish the proposed object, is to begin with as little as possible in the shape of concession to the people. Or rather, he seems to think that a sort of constitutional government may be organized with almost nothing in the form of a written and defined charter. But he loses sight of the fact that the times are widely different from those long ages through which England *worked out* her constitution. There is now infinitely more light on the subject of making Constitutions than there was during that long and rude period. No nation, with the example of England before its eyes, will hereafter be content to pass through what she did.

"Tempora mutantur, et nos mutantur cum illis."

We live fast in these days of steamships, railroads, and electric telegraphs. Everything must now be done with rapidity, if done at all. The slow procedures of the ancients will not suit us. We must reach in a few years, or months, results which with them required long ages. The King of Prussia should bear this in mind. The example of England, in her protracted and dreadful struggles to gain one principle or point after another in her Constitution, will not serve in these days. On the other hand, those in Prussia who demand a constitution ought to remember that the heavens and the earth were not created in one day, although *that* would have been practicable for the infinite Architect. It required a long time to perfect

(if we may use the word) the British Constitution; and it is not likely that Prussia either can or will obtain a good one in a day, a year, or even several years.

In the second place, we certainly believe that things cannot remain long as they are now in Prussia; and as we think that the King is too wise and good a man to retreat from his present position and fall back upon the bayonets of his army, we are quite sure that he will go forward, perhaps not immediately, but sooner or later. We are inclined to think that the rising billows of popular—we should say *national*—discontent will rise so high, that in a year or two he will be compelled to give his people another and greatly "enlarged and improved" edition of his present meagre constitution. In that case he will probably dismiss his present cabinet,* and call to the head of a new one his friend Chevalier Bunsen, the able Prussian ambassador at the court of St. James—of all men in Germany the best instructed, in our opinion, in constitutional government. He has been for years in London, and has studied on the spot the British Constitution and all the details of its working. He is the fittest man of Germany to devise and carry into operation a broad, liberal and well-defined Constitution. Indeed, we have been informed that he has, at the request of the King, submitted a sketch of a Constitution of a very complete nature; but his Majesty prefers to make an experiment with his own scheme.

We have said that the state of things in Germany cannot remain long as it is at present. This is our firm conviction. About one year ago M. Guizot said, in the Chamber of Deputies, *toute l'Allemagne est en feu!* And, although there was something of French hyperbole in this strong metaphorical expression, yet there was a great deal of truth in it. There are many elements fermenting there, besides a desire of liberty, well defined and practicable. There is, if we are correctly informed, and we think we are, a strong tendency to rush into the extreme of licentiousness. There is a large amount of low, vulgar infidelity,

* The present cabinet of the King embraces some men of talents—such as Eichhorn—but it cannot be said to be an able one. It will not compare with that of the late King, especially when Stein was at the head of it.

in close alliance with radicalism, socialism, and other wrong economical and moral opinions of one grade and another, which threatens to overthrow the very foundations of society. Still, we trust, that the good sense, kindly feeling, and almost naturally conservative character of the German people, will keep them back from all avoidable excesses. With the bloody pages of the Revolutions of both England and France before their eyes, humanity entire will have cause to weep if the children of Hermann and Luther should plunge into all the horrors of a fratricidal war.

That Frederick William IV. may be so influenced and guided, as to be induced to give his people such a Constitution as will be best for them—such as will render them happy and prosperous—must be the wish—the prayer rather—of all good men. For ourselves, we consider him one of the best sovereigns in Europe, as it regards benevolence of heart, simplicity and purity of domestic life, and general rectitude of intentions. We are very far from thinking that he is not liable to make serious mistakes. We think that his ardent and impetuous temperament will hurry him into many an act which he had better avoid. He may not always be wise in his measures, or in the manner of executing them; but we believe him sincerely desirous of doing what will be best, so far as he can see, for his people. He is naturally a man of humane and kind feelings. And we have occasion to know that he is prompt to do not only justice, but even grace, where a proper case is presented to him. His position at this moment is eminently difficult, and he needs a large measure of that wisdom which God alone can give. As we have already hinted, we are far from thinking that, with one or two exceptions, he is surrounded by as able men as the exigency of the times demands. That there are such men in Prussia, we do not doubt, nor that they will be shortly forthcoming.

The recent acts of the Prussian government, in giving publicity to the proceedings of the courts; in proposing (if we understand the matter) to withdraw the surveillance of the press altogether from the Diet of Germany, and place it under the control of the government of the country in which it may be; in granting a large

amount of religious liberty; and in the formation of the Zollverein or Customs-Union, all prove that Frederick William IV. must be an enlightened man. On the last named two measures we must say a word.

If we are rightly informed, the late edict on the subject of religious liberty, whilst it does not release any one from bearing his share of the burthens of the Established Church, allows an unrestricted dissent. In other words, it introduces a state of things in this respect, similar to what exists in the British realm—a state of things infinitely better than that which existed a few years ago.

As to the Zollverein, or “Commercial League,” it relieves all the portions of Germany which have come into it* from the numerous and vexatious difficulties arising from each kingdom and petty duchy having its own custom houses, and its own tariff. We think it probable that it will have a far-reaching influence upon the political destinies of Germany. It may prove an “entering wedge” to a consolidation of all the northern German States at least—a consummation much to be desired.

Considerable censure has been bestowed upon the conduct of Frederick William IV. in relation to the affair of Cracow, but we think not justly. We have the best of reasons for believing that the King has been greatly grieved by the deceptive and high-handed course which Austria pursued in that business. The case demands a few words.

Cracow, by the partition of Poland among the three great powers, fell, we believe, to Austria. Napoleon in 1807, when he created the grand duchy of Warsaw, annexed Cracow to that duchy. The Congress of Vienna, finding no little difficulty in deciding to which of the two powers that desired it—Austria and Russia—to give it, when they converted the duchy of Warsaw into the modern kingdom of Poland, constituted Cracow, with a small adjacent territory, into a republic,† and put it under the auspices of the great parties to the treaty of Vienna—Austria,

* The portions of Germany which have entered the Customs-Union, embrace more than 28,000,000 of inhabitants.

† Embracing about 137,000 inhabitants, of whom 50,000 are Jews.

Russia, Prussia, France and England. It was not long until Austria renewed the agitation of the question, either under pretence that the republic was a sort of nuisance to its great neighbors, or because she wanted it, as Ahab did Naboth's vineyard. But the late King of Prussia would not listen to the proposition. Not long after the present King ascended the throne of his father, Austria again brought forward the question. Prussia still refused. At last the recent outbreak occurred, and several thousand men, Cracovites and Polish refugees, taking up arms, sallied forth to promote a rebellion in Galicia or Austrian Poland. This ill-advised and ill-directed movement, although it ended in defeat, gave Austria the occasion she desired for pressing successfully her suit, saying to the still reluctant King of Prussia, that there never could be tranquillity on the borders until the republic of Cracow was abolished. In an evil hour Frederick William IV. consented that Austria (Russia having yielded) might take possession of Cracow, but upon the express condition that she should first gain the consent of France and England. The consent of Prussia having been gained, Metternich did not wait for that of France and England, but, after having taken possession of the city and territory in question, went to work to negotiate with both about the affair as a "*fait accompli*." France yielded readily enough, whilst protesting against the transaction. England was displeased, but could do nothing but remonstrate. The King of Prussia was greatly grieved, as we know from good authority, but the evil was done. This is a simple history of the case, and sets the conduct of that monarch in a very different light from that in which it is very generally viewed.

But we must bring this sketch of the life and character of Frederick William IV. to a close. We have endeavored to speak impartially and truly of that monarch, but are well aware that this notice will be considered by many as entirely too favorable. This we cannot help. We have given our conscientious opinions respecting his character and conduct. We could not do otherwise, having derived them from sources that are worthy, as we believe, of all confidence. By many in

Germany, especially by certain classes of people who hate his Protestant and strictly evangelical faith, he is greatly spoken against. There is an infidelity in that country of the most malignant character, and those who have imbibed it are, without exception, the enemies of the King of Prussia. They hate his religious creed, and by consequence, they hate him. And among the emigrants* from that land, who come to our shores, there are many counterparts of those we have just referred to. Some of these cannot find epithets sufficiently abusive to express all their hatred of his Majesty.†

It would have been very easy for us to have written such a notice of the King of Prussia as would have chimed in with the prejudices of those people among us who think that it is impossible for a king to be either an honest or a sensible man. There are brawlers among us who find it convenient and easy to court popularity with men of ignorant and vulgar minds, by denouncing everything in the shape of monarchy, and all persons who belong to what are called the high ranks. But there are also men, of all parties, who have too much elevation of mind and justice of heart to sympathize, for one moment, with such a spirit.

For ourselves, we dare affirm that we yield to no one in admiration of republican government. We believe that it is the normal one. The Divine Being gave his people—his "chosen nation"—a republican economy; and a glorious commonwealth it was! But when He found

* Whilst there are many truly enlightened, well-informed, and excellent foreigners, who come to us from Germany, France, and other portions of Europe, there are not a few who know very little about the countries from which they have come, save the petty localities in which they were born, and in which they passed their lives down, till the day of quitting their native lands. The opinions of such are very little worth, especially in regard to both facts and men whereof they had no sources of information save the exaggerated, and often baseless and absurd stories which they heard some one or other repeat.

† We have heard Frederick William IV. called, by some of his *compatriots* of the class alluded to in the text, a "liar," a "tyrant," a "knave," a "drunkard," and we know not what all. Such people are entirely welcome to their own opinions of his Majesty, and every one else; but they presume too much, if they think that the people of this country will receive them without examination, or that they will allow them to outweigh those of great and good men in Germany who have the best means of knowing the truth.

that they were not fit for such a government, "He gave them a king in his anger." In both cases, however, he required his people to obey the government *de facto*. And much as we love our invaluable political institutions, and deem them truly incomparable, we should consider ourselves bereft of common sense, if, knowing the state of the world as we do, we should insist upon it, that all other nations are at present prepared for them.

We believe that God permits the nations to decide for themselves what form of government they will have. From the first, our government has acted upon the principle that, in all ordinary cases, the government *de facto* is the government *de jure*. And as we thus expect other nations to treat our government with respect, it is our duty to treat the forms of government which they choose to maintain, with similar respect. It is this that has inspired a confidence in all other governments, in relation to us—be their form what it may—which is in the highest degree honorable to us.

We have spoken of the domestic happiness of Frederick William IV. with deep interest, for we know no greater proof of the goodness of a man's heart than his love for his wife and family, nor a stronger pledge of general rectitude of purpose. We will add that, as the King can find very little time for reading, amid the cares and burthens of government, he still has the distinguished and excellent Humboldt with

him several hours daily, in order to derive from the conversation of the greatest *savant* living, that knowledge and instruction which he has no leisure to gain from books.

In terminating this sketch, we have only to remark, that whilst we consider the position of Frederick William IV. to be extremely difficult, and even critical, we think that never had monarch such an opportunity to immortalize himself. Let him be prompt in giving to his people a good Constitution—one corresponding to the intelligence and the demands of the age—and he cannot fail to render his memory illustrious in all coming time. He might, if he were so disposed, rally all Germany around his throne, and create a great and happy empire in the heart of Europe, which would be an effectual barrier against Gallic ambition on the one hand, and Russian on the other. And if Austria and Russia should attempt to hinder or molest him, he need only threaten them both with the restoration of Poland to her ancient independence, and the limits she had in the 16th century. Uniting Germany around him, he could at a word raise up a mighty kingdom on its eastern frontier, composed of the countries inhabited by the western branches of the Slavonic races—Poland, Bohemia, Hungary—and effectually put it out of the power of Austria and Russia even to trouble the rest of Europe.

HAMLET.

THE tragedy of Hamlet has probably caused more of perplexity and discussion, than any other of Shakspeare's plays. Others of them may have more of interest for particular minds, or particular states of mind, or particular periods of life; but none of them equals Hamlet in universality of interest. Doubtless this results, in part, from the hero's being "a concentration of all the interests that belong to humanity." His history is the very extraction and

efficacy of the thoughts, and feelings, and inward experiences of us all. His life is a picture of blighted hopes and crushed affections, from which we may solve the darkest enigmas of our existence, and over which our aching hearts may bleed themselves into repose. Hamlet, in short, is an universal genius, in the depths and variety of his feelings and faculties, almost rivaling Shakspeare himself, and engaged, not in creating or revealing the true, the beau-

tiful, and the good, but in conflict with the dark powers of the world. If there be a heart, whose best affections have never been breathed upon by hope, nor broken down by despair; which has never been called to weep over the desecration or the degradation of its most cherished objects; which has no springs of life to be sweetened by sympathy, or embittered by disappointment; and which has put forth no promises to be fanned by airs from heaven, or scorched by blasts from hell; such a heart may indeed contemplate the picture of Hamlet without emotion, and may find exemption from the sorrows of life in the iceberg of its own insensibility.

Coleridge very finely remarks somewhere, that Shakspeare's characters are classes of men individualized. Of most of them, this seems to us profoundly true; and Hamlet seems to differ from the others, in that he is the race itself individualized. He is a sort of glass wherein we may all see ourselves, provided we have any self; and it is not so correct to say, that he represents any one man or class of men, as that he represents them all. Hamlet, in short, is the very abridgment and eclecticism of humanity: in the words of another, it is *we* who are Hamlet.

Accordingly, scarce any character in history has provoked so great a diversity of opinion as Hamlet; for the more generic and comprehensive a man is, the more various will the judgments of men naturally be concerning him. One man thinks Hamlet is great, but wicked; another, that he is good, but weak; a third, that he is a coward, and dare not act; a fourth, that he has too much intellect for his will, and so reflects away the time of action. Doubtless there are facts in the representation which, considered by themselves, would sustain any one of these views; but none of them seems reconcilable with all the facts taken together. Yet, notwithstanding this diversity of facts and conclusions, all agree in thinking, and feeling, and speaking about Hamlet as an actual person. It is easy, indeed, to invest with plausibility almost any theory in regard to him; but it is extremely hard to make any theory comprehend the whole subject: and, though all are impressed with the truth of the character, no one is satisfied with another's explanation of it. The

question is, why, with this unanimity as to his being a man, do men differ so much as to what sort of a man he is?

In reasoning upon facts, we are apt to forget what complex, many-sided things we are dealing with. We often speak of them as very simple and intelligible things, whereas, in reality, they are most profoundly and inscrutably mysterious: they may indeed be used to explain other things, but they cannot themselves be explained. For example, how many causes, elements, conditions, and processes go to the forming of a rose? The combined agencies of all nature work together in its production—are all represented by it, and inferable from it. Thus facts involve and infer many things at the same time; they present manifold elements and qualities in consistency and unity, and so express a diversity of meanings which cannot be gathered up into a form of logical explanation. Even if we seize and draw out, severally and successively, all the properties of a fact, still we are as far as ever from producing the effect of their combination in the fact itself. It is this mysteriousness of facts that begets our respect for them, our docility to them, and our interest in them: could we master them, we should cease to regard them: could we explain them, we should feel at liberty to substitute our explanations for the things explained. For, to see round and through a thing, implies a sort of conquest over it; and when we get, or think we have got, above a thing, we naturally either overlook it, or else look down upon it: finding or fancying we have mastered a thing, we are apt to neglect it, or, what is worse, put off that humility towards it, which, besides being itself the better part of wisdom, is our only key to the remainder.

In this complexity of facts, is obviously contained the material of innumerable theories; for, "in so great a store of properties belonging to the self-same thing, every man's mind may take hold of some special consideration above the rest;" and it is characteristic of facts, that, seen through any given theory, they always seem to prove only that one, though really affording equal proof to fifty other theories. In short, many of the elements, perhaps all the elements of truth, may meet together in a fact; and nothing is more common than for several minds

to single out different elements of the same fact, and then go on to reason from a part, as from the whole. Hence, there naturally come to be various opinions respecting the same fact: generalizing too hastily from the surface of things, men often arrive at contradictory conclusions, forgetting, that of a given fact, a vast many things may be true in their place and degree, yet none of them true in such sort as to hinder the truth of others. Human life is full of practical as well as speculative errors and mistakes, resulting from this partial and one-sided view of things: seizing some one principle, or being seized by it, men proceed, as they say, to carry it out; never stopping to think how it is limited and restrained on all sides by other principles. Thus men often draw a button so near the eye, as to shut out all the rest of creation, and then go smashing through the world, mistaking their own ignorance or obstinacy for conscientiousness.

Now Hamlet is undoubtedly the most complex character in dramatic literature. He is all varieties of character in one; is continually turning up a new side, appearing under a new phase, undergoing some new development; and before we can measure and map him in any one form, he has passed into another. He thus touches us at all points, surrounds us, as it were, so that great circumspection is required to see the whole of him at once, and so to avoid mistaking him for several persons. This complexity and versatility of character has often been mistaken for inconsistency; hence the contradictory opinions respecting him, different minds taking up very different impressions of him, and even the same mind taking up very different impressions of him at different times. Hamlet, in short, like other facts, is many-sided, and many men of many minds may see themselves in different sides of him; but when, upon comparing notes, they find him agreeing with them all, they are perplexed, and conclude him inconsistent, because they are themselves too one-sided to recognize his consistency. In so great a diversity of elements and principles, they lose the perception of identity, and cannot see how he can be so many and still be but one. Doubtless, Hamlet seems the more real, for the very reason that we cannot understand him; our inability to see

through him, or to discern the source and manner of his impressions upon us, brings him closer to nature, and makes him appear the more like a fact, and so widens and deepens his hold on our thoughts. For where there is life, there must naturally be more or less of change, the very law of life being identity in mutability; and in Hamlet, the variety and rapidity of changes are so managed, as only to infer the more intense, active, and prolific vitality. In this multitude of changes, however, it is extremely difficult to perceive the constant principle; these outward contradictions make the character more powerful, indeed, on the feelings, but much less intelligible to the mind; they help us to feel, but hinder us from seeing, the inward vital unity whence they spring.

As is generally the case with Shakespeare's characters, in order to apprehend Hamlet aright, it is necessary to go round behind the text into the elements and processes of his mind, of which the text but gives the results. For one of the excellencies, in which Shakespeare is without a competitor, is that of painting the interior history of minds. While unfolding their present condition, he, at the same time, suggests a long series of preceding conditions; portrays in far-stretching perspective the various stages and changes of a mind, each growing out of, and growing above, the one that preceded it. Among these instances of historical perspective, perhaps there is none more worthy of study than Hamlet.

Up to his father's death, Hamlet's mind, busied in developing its innate riches, had found room for no sentiments towards others but a gentle and generous trust and confidence. Delighted with the appearances of good, and protected by his rank from the naked approaches of evil, he had no motive to pry through the semblances into the reality of surrounding characters. The ideas of princely elevation and of moral rectitude, springing forth simultaneously in his mind, had intertwisted their fibres closely and firmly together. While the chaste forms of youthful imagination had kept his own heart pure, he had framed his conceptions of others according to the model within himself. To the feelings of the son, the prince, the gentleman, the friend, and the scholar,

had lately been joined the feelings of the lover; and his heart, oppressed by the redundancy of hopes and joys that enriched it, had breathed forth its fullness in "almost all the holy vows of heaven." Though soaring at will into the loftiest, or grasping the widest, or scanning the deepest regions of thought, he yet felt how poor and paltry are all the gifts and shows of intellect, compared to purity, and gentleness, and lowliness of heart; could repose, with all the satisfaction which superior natures alone can know, upon the bosom of virgin innocence and virgin loveliness; and in the simple goodness which is unconscious of itself, from its very perfection, could discern a worth which puts to shame the proudest exhibitions and triumphs of mind.

In his father, endowed with every royal and manly quality, Hamlet had realized the bright ideal of character which he aspired to exemplify in himself. Whatever noble images and ideas he had gathered from the fields of poetry and philosophy, he had learned to associate with that sacred name. To the throne he looked forward with hope and with fear, as an elevation from whence to diffuse the blessings of a wise sovereignty, and receive the homage of a grateful submission. To reproduce in himself his father's character, was, in his view, to deserve, and therefore to secure, his father's place; and as the crown was not hereditary, he regarded his own prospects of succession as suspended on the continuance of his father's life, until he could discover in himself the virtues that originated his father's title. In his father's death, therefore, he lost the chief support of both his affections and his pretensions.

But though bereavement and disappointment had thus united to teach Hamlet the power of sorrow, the foundations of his peace and happiness were yet unshaken. The prospects of the prince had perhaps vanished, only to disclose still brighter prospects for the man. He could still love, and trust, and revere; the fire-side and the student's bower were yet open to him; truth and beauty, thought and affection, had not yet hidden their faces from him. His mind, though deeply saddened and subdued, was not diseased; and his bereavement had the effect to quicken and chasten his sensibility without disordering

his affections. With a heart, cunning and prompt to discover and appropriate the remunerations of life, he could compensate the loss of some objects, with a more free and tranquil enjoyment of such as remained. In the absence of his father, he could collect and concentrate upon his mother the feelings hitherto shared between them; and in cases like this, the part of an object often exceeds the whole, inasmuch as a religious feeling towards the dead comes in to enrich and sanctify an affection for the living. And even if his mother also had but died, the loss, though unspeakably bitter, would not have been baleful to him; for, though separated from the chief objects of his love, and trust, and reverence, he would still have retained those sentiments themselves in all their strength and beauty. Nay, death would not so much have taken her away from him, as brought her nearer to his feelings and raised her to a higher place in them; as her form vanished from his sight, the sweet, sacred image of a mother, which filial piety loves to cherish, would have come,

"Apparelled in more precious habit,
More moving, delicate, and full of life,
Into the eye and prospect of his soul,
Than when she lived indeed."

For when those whom such a being loves die with their honors fresh and bright about them, they become, in some sort, omnipresent and immortal to him:

"The future brightens on his sight,
For on the past has fallen a light
That tempts him to adore."

It is not with his mother, however, but with his faith in her, that Hamlet is forced to part; it is not herself, but her honor, that dies to him. To his prophetic soul her hasty and incestuous marriage brings at once conviction of his mother's infidelity and suspicion of his uncle's treachery to his father. In the disclosure of her guilt and baseness his best affections themselves suffer death; for while, to such a mind, death immortalizes the objects of its love, infamy annihilates them. Where he has most loved, and trusted, and revered, there he finds himself most deceived. The

sadness of bereavement now settles into the deep, dark gloom of a wounded spirit; and life appears a burden to be borne, not a blessing to be cherished. In this condition, the appearance of his father's ghost, its awful disclosures and still more awful injunctions, confirming the suspicion of his uncle's treachery, and implicating his mother in the crime, complete his desolation of mind.

But this is not all. The garden of his own life having now become a desert, he feels that he can breathe nothing but desolation over the life which he has once sweetened with the music of his vows. In his terrible visitation he reads the necessity of giving up the gentle, the cherished Ophelia; for he loves her too well to entangle her in the web of horrors from which he sees no escape for himself. But, though he resigns the object of his love, he does not and cannot resign the love itself; and the consciousness that he must leave her whom he loves, and leave her even because he loves her, finishes the death and burial of his hopes.

"The sigh so piteous and profound,
As it did seem to shatter all his bulk,
And end his being,"

could only spring from the depths of a wounded spirit, as he gazed, in the anguish of despair, on the beloved one who had written her name all over his thoughts.

So much for Hamlet's internal history until the extinction of his earthly prospects and purposes in the awful words, "Remember me." But amid these accumulated agonies, and though suffering all that he can suffer save remorse and self-reproach, he yet retains all his original integrity and uprightness of soul, and his quick moral sensibilities shrink from the very conception of meanness and wrong. In the depths of his being, even below the region of distinct consciousness, there lurks the instinct and impulse of a moral law that forbids revenge, especially such a revenge as he is called upon to administer. With this impulse of rectitude thus dimly and deeply working within him, the injunction of his father's ghost comes in conflict.

What, indeed, is the quality of the act enjoined upon him? Nothing less, to be

sure, than to kill at once his uncle, his mother's husband, and his anointed sovereign. And this deed, thus involving homicide, parricide, and regicide, all rolled into one, he is called to perform, not as an act of justice, and in a judicial manner, but as an act of revenge, and by assassination. Surely this could hardly be expected of one who had the misfortune to live before the dawn of that wisdom which so admirably teacheth, that to kill a father, or mother, or bishop, or king, is but common homicide! How shall Hamlet justify such a deed to the world? How vindicate himself from the reproach of the very crime he is called upon to revenge? For the evidence upon which he is required to act is in its nature available at best only in the court of his own conscience. In view of such an act he might well say to himself:

"If I could find example
Of thousands who had struck anointed kings,
And flourished after, I'd not do't; but since
Nor brass, nor stone, nor parchment, bears not
one,
Let villainy itself forswear't."

Hamlet, then, is called upon to punish one crime, by committing what seems to him another crime; for the same religion which in his mind enjoins filial piety also forbids revenge; so that he dare neither reject nor perform the mandate from the ghost. Thus his conscience is divided, not merely against his inclination, but against itself; it plucks him on, and plucks him off; it provokes the resolution, but prevents the performance. However much he multiplies reasons and motives upon himself in favor of the deed, there yet springs up, from a depth in his nature which reflection has never fathomed, an impulse against it, which he can neither account for nor resist. The truth is, his moral instincts are too strong for his intellectual convictions. It is the triumph of a pure moral nature over temptation in its most imposing and insinuating form—in the form of a sacred call from heaven, or what is such to him. He thinks, indeed, that he ought to perform the act, resolves that he will do it, and blames himself for not doing it; but there is a power within him and yet above him, which, in spite of himself, overmasters his resolutions and thwarts them; and

he cannot do the thing for the simple reason, though he knows it not, and believes it not, that he is too good to do it. The trouble with him, in short, lies not in himself, but in his situation; it all arises from the impossibility of translating the outward call of duty into a free, spontaneous moral impulse; and of course he cannot perform it, until he has so translated it; for he is so constituted, that in such an undertaking he must act from himself, not from another.

It is from this strife between incompatible duties, that Hamlet's perplexity and indecision spring. For escape from this dilemma all his faculties and resources are taxed and strained to the uttermost. His moral sensitiveness, shrinking from the dreadful summons to revenge, throws him back upon his reflective powers, and sends him through the abysses of thought, in quest of a reconciliation between his conflicting duties, so that he may shelter either the performance of the deed from the reproach of irreligion, or the non-performance from the reproach of filial impiety. In this condition springs of thought, and feeling, and action, beyond the reach of our minds, are opened within him. Here, then, we have an example of a great mind so circumstanced that all its greatness has to come out in thought; which, indeed, seems to have been the poet's design.

And it should be especially remarked withal, that the same voice which calls Hamlet to this terrible undertaking, also reveals to him the fearful retributions of futurity; so that in proportion as he is nerved by a sense of the duty, he is at the same time shaken by a dread of the responsibility. "The eternal blazon," which "must not be to ears of flesh and blood," hurries him away from action into meditation on the dread realities of the invisible world; and his resolution is suspended by the apprehensions started up in his mind by the ghost's disclosures respecting "the secrets of its prison house." Nay, his filial reverence itself leads him, first to regret, then to doubt, and finally to disbelieve, that his *father* has laid upon him an injunction so repugnant to his sense of right. Upon reflection he discerns in the nature of the mandate something that makes him question and distrust its source; it clashes with his sentiment of moral rectitude; and he wisely thinks, that "light which leads astray cannot be light from heaven." It seems to him more probable, that the ghost should be a *counterfeit* of his father, than that his *father* should give such an order. He must "have grounds more relative than this."

[To be concluded in our next number.]

FOREIGN MISCELLANY.

THE intelligence from Europe is of more than ordinary interest. The British Parliament has met at an earlier period than usual, for the dispatch of business. The only proceeding of which we yet have information, is the re-election of the Speaker of the House of Commons. The composition of that body is stated by the London Quarterly Review to consist of

Whigs, Radicals, Repealers and	
Chartists, - - - -	327
Peelites, - - - -	80
Protectionists, - - -	236
Two double returns, - -	2
Sudbury disfranchised, - -	2
Undeclared and doubtful, -	11
Total, - - - -	658

The change in the persons of the members, is said to be vastly greater than was ever known before—excepting only the election which succeeded the passage of the Reform Act. There were then 280 new members, and in the present instance the number is 223, which, under the circumstances, is a more remarkable change. The alteration in the pursuits of the members is also indicative of political or social change. The number of railway directors, engineers and contractors, of barristers, merchants, retail traders, political writers and lecturers, is greater; while the naval and military officers, the connections of aristocratic and wealthy families, have diminished in numerical force. The intentions of the Russell ministry are yet unknown, not even the Queen's Speech on the opening of Parliament having yet ar-

rived here. Several failures have taken place in the commercial part of the community, but not so serious in amount as those which have preceded; and it is confidently hoped that the severity of the crisis has passed. A steady influx of gold and silver has rendered the currency less restricted; although discounts still remain at very high rates, and money very difficult to be obtained. The Directors of the Bank of England availed themselves of one portion of the recommendation of the ministry, mentioned in our last—the charging “a high rate of interest;” but omitted to comply with that which urged an enlargement of the amount of discounts and advances; and their proceedings in this respect have called forth considerable animadversion. The number of bills drawn in the colonies, which have been returned in consequence of the late failures, together with the low price of sugar and other colonial products, will yet cause considerable embarrassment; but on the other hand, the slight rise in cotton and grain, will cause a greater buoyancy in the trade with this country; and, although upon the whole, the amelioration is but small, the change will operate to restore confidence, and may prove more stable from being of slow motion. Strong hopes are entertained that the Royal Bank of Liverpool and the Bank of North and South Wales, both of which have suspended payment, will be enabled to resume business. Government stocks are more firm in price; and although the Bank of England still charges eight per cent. discount, many private establishments are content with seven and six and a half per cent. Accounts from the manufacturing districts are still unfavorable, and notwithstanding some little improvement has been evinced, it is to be apprehended that short work and a high price of provisions will be productive of very great distress among the operatives and the laboring population generally.

Ireland still continues to present a melancholy spectacle, and must cause very considerable embarrassment to the present Parliament. Famine appears again to threaten its appearance, while murder and agrarian outrages are so much on the increase, as to have produced a proclamation from the Lord Lieutenant, calling on all well-disposed persons to assist in their repression, and threatening offenders with the utmost rigor of punishment. The worst features in these offences are, that they seem to be committed by persons who have not the excuse of destitution; and that in many instances the victims are resident proprietors, who are exerting themselves to benefit the peasantry in their neighborhoods. The assassination of Major Rowan, of Stokestown, in the county of Roscommon, appears an offence of a most unaccountable character. With three years' rent due from the tenants of his estate, he last year chartered two vessels to assist a portion of them to emigrate, and had just bor-

rowed money to effect large improvements on his estate, by which he expected to employ a large number of persons during the coming winter. While engaged in this and other beneficent employments, he was shot down on his own estate—an occurrence, among others, which most painfully shows the disorganized state of society. A number of Irish members of Parliament, and influential persons, organized, for the purpose of demanding from the government employment for the people, on the unfinished improvements which were commenced last year; and, it is to be hoped, that in the present state of the peasantry, their efforts will be directed to measures of a purely practical character, and that no political feeling will be allowed to thwart the measures so imperatively demanded.

Intelligence has been received of the total loss of the packet ship *Stephen Whitney*, which left New-York on the 8th October. Mistaking the light upon Rock Island, near Cape Clear, on the South Coast of Ireland, for the old Head of Kinsale, she went broadside on a rock called the West Calf, about four miles inside the Cape, and in less than ten minutes was dashed to atoms, involving in her destruction, the melancholy loss of her captain and no less than 92 of her crew and passengers—18 only, out of 110, having escaped with life—the ship with many articles on board being totally lost.

The commercial and financial difficulties of England do not appear to have reached France: on the contrary securities have been steady, and notwithstanding the negotiation of a loan of 250 millions of francs which was taken by the Rothschilds, and by which a large amount of fresh stock was created, the price of funds rose at the Bourse. A political agitation for the extension of the elective franchise is active in France, and though greatly discouraged by the government, large meetings are held, at which the name of the king is not very respectfully greeted. Louis Philippe suffers much in public estimation from a belief of his interfering personally, with all the details of government, in a greater degree than is consistent with a limited and constitutional monarchy, where the responsibility for such acts is exclusively confined to the ministers. Count Bresson, who figured considerably in negotiating the marriage of the Queen of Spain, and also of her sister to the Duc de Montpensier, lately committed suicide, while ambassador at Naples; and his immediate predecessor at that post, Count Mortier, made a like attempt while laboring under mental alienation. Monsieur Deschappelles, the celebrated chess-player, died in Paris about the beginning of the past month; and Monsieur Parmentier, who was so disgracefully connected with the late proceedings of General Cubieres and Monsieur Teste, died of grief at Lure. It is said that the Archduchess of Parma, Maria Louisa, widow of

Napoleon, has married the Count de Bombelles, one of her ministers. The *Commerce* announces that reports from the Prefects have been received by the Minister of the Interior, which state that the potato crop had been gathered throughout France, and that it was abundant and of good quality, the disease having only shown itself at a few points and its effects being insignificant.

The *Universal Gazette* of Prussia, publishes a letter from St. Petersburg of the 17th November, which states:—

"The cholera makes fresh progress in the two directions, which it is following in Russia. It has just broken out in the governments of Simbrisk, Kazan, Nijni, Novogorod, Riasan, Poltawa, and Tamboff. Thus far, it does not appear disposed to spread on the side of Podolia and Galicia, and it even appears to have very little intensity in that neighborhood. In that direction it has only shown itself on one point, at Iekaterinoslaf, where it traversed the Dnieper. Without counting Georgia, Caucasus, and the country of the Cossacks of the Black Sea, it already reigns in sixteen governments. On the 30th ult. it broke out at Moscow."

The latest intelligence from the latter place states the number of cholera patients there on the 16th November, at 105; on the evening of the 17th October, the number was 135.

Spain still continues the victim of intrigue. The French party is in the ascendant, and notwithstanding the constant changes in the ministry, Narvaez appears to be the director of affairs, aided by the queen mother, Christina. An apparent reconciliation has been effected between Queen Isabella and her husband, but a strong opinion is maintained in Madrid that their feelings are as much estranged as ever, and that their present union is only a matter of state necessity. The Carlist and Montemolinist parties are endeavoring to excite civil war in Catalonia and other provinces, but meet with little encouragement from the peasantry, and are generally routed when met by the queen's troops. Espartero, the exiled general, has been offered the embassy to London; which he has refused, it is said, on account of want of sufficient fortune to sustain the dignity of the station.

The civil war in Portugal having been terminated through the combined intervention of the allies of the queen's government, the parties opposed are busy at the work of intrigue, and are making great exertions to gain the supremacy at the coming elections.

In Italy, Pius IX. still continues to persevere in his judicious reforms. His views all appear to tend towards practical results, and are, for that reason, likely to prove more lasting and effective. A commercial treaty and customs league has lately been concluded between the Pope, the King of Sardinia, and the Grand Duke of Tuscany and Duke of Lucca, which

may be considered the first step towards a political union of the Italian States. The terms of this treaty will not be made public until it is known whether the King of Naples and the Duke of Modena will join the league, propositions having been made to them to do so. A Paris paper announces that the Sultan has sent Chebel Effendi on a mission to Rome, to express his desire that the protection of the Christians of the Libanus should take place in a direct manner by the intervention of a representative of the Holy See; and the Pope has, in consequence, re-established the office of Patriarch of Jerusalem, and raised to that dignity a simple missionary priest.

The civil war in Switzerland has commenced. The troops of the Federal Government were investing Fribourg, and the bombardment of that place was said to have commenced on the 12th inst.; but the latter fact appears doubtful, as reports of a later date state that the Grand Council of Fribourg had assembled, and demanded a suspension of hostilities, which had been granted by the commander of the Federal forces. Great excitement exists in the Tyrol, in consequence of the events taking place in Switzerland, and which is increased by the movements of the Austrian troops. It is understood that overtures have been made, by the representatives of some of the continental powers, to the British Cabinet, for an amicable mediation to terminate the differences now existing in the Helvetic republic.

Mr. Gutzlaff, the missionary to China, has just completed a voluminous history of that empire, and sent the manuscript to Mr. Cotta, the publisher at Stuttgart. He has published at Hong Kong a universal geography, in Chinese, with sixty large maps; and has begun to compose a dictionary of that language. He has founded a Chinese society, which already numbers 600 members, and includes mandarins and native *savans* of the first rank; and the society has already published a large number of popular works. This establishment was instituted from a conviction that Christianity, and its civilizing results, can only be successfully propagated in China, by the Chinese themselves.

Dr. Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy, the great musical composer, died suddenly, of inflammation of the brain, at Leipsic, on the 4th of November last, aged 30. He was born at Berlin, on the 3d of February, 1808; and was son of the celebrated Archæologist James Solomon Bartholdy, and grandson of the philosopher Mendelssohn. At 8 years of age, he had composed some remarkable pieces, and performed on the piano, at Paris and London, with great success. Six songs for a soprano voice, three motets for mixed chorusses, (already in the press,) a large portion of his new *Oratorio* of Christ, and some other works, were found in his writing desk, after his decease.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Old Wine in New Bottles ; or, Spare Hours of a Student in Paris. By AUGUSTUS KINSLEY GARDNER, M. D. New-York: C. S. Francis & Co., 252 Broadway. Boston: J. H. Francis, 128 Washington street. 1848.

THIS volume is a republication of a series of letters, written by the author when he was a medical student in Paris, to the Newark *Daily Advertiser*. They are exceedingly entertaining and full of interesting description, good humor and good sense. The author has an observant eye, and while his correspondence lets us into the heart of life in the gay capital, its thousand excitements evidently did not disturb the serenity of his understanding. He appears the same quiet observer in all the various scenes through which he takes us—the theatres, the opera, the hospitals, the *bal masque*. One who wishes to ramble around the city, which seems the physical and social centre of the world, as London does its intellectual and moral, could not choose a more agreeable companion. He is always cheerful and amusing; not narrow in his views of French life, but at the same time thoroughly and indisputably American in his observations and reflections. Many of his opinions are deeply colored with the mode of thinking peculiar to physicians; but that of course does not diminish the gratification of the reader. It is curious to observe how differently the same incident will be regarded by different minds. The following, for example, would hardly have come from a young lawyer, after witnessing an execution by the guillotine:—

“An individual, it is agreed, by all people of sense, may take life in necessary self-defence. What may be thus done by one may be done by another, and so society becomes invested with the same high prerogative, as a *dernier resort*. I do not acknowledge myself under any obligation to incur the trouble, expense and risk of chaining a wild beast of a man, to keep him from preying on his fellow-men. The virtuous portion of the community is not bound, and sometimes is not able, to waste the fruits of its hard and honest labor in building penitentiaries, in which the worthless, aye, and still dangerous existence of a demon may be carefully prolonged, and his body clothed and fed—often much better than the poor who are taxed to pay for it—till the culprit shall be pardoned by an impotent or corrupt executive, to vex the country again with his murders and conflagrations; or till a natural death shall do for the people

what they had not the firmness to do for themselves—rid them of an enormous and perilous burden, not imposed by any dictate of natural law.”

Here is no sympathy with crime, no inquiry into palliative circumstances. The man who was guillotined had attempted several times to murder his wife, and at last nearly beat her brains out with a hammer. The doctor was evidently glad to see his head cut off. As the reader glides over the description he feels so likewise, though it is only medical and military men, whose nerves are educated out of the sympathetic influence of pain, that can witness such things with a becoming indifference. Perhaps it is owing more to this sympathetic influence, which the subtle fancy can any moment image to the mind, that we have such discordance of opinion respecting capital punishment. The easy confidence with which physicians throw out opinions on social questions is often not only entertaining, but really instructive; we are led to see the matter in a new light. A lawyer is troubled with the uncertainties of jury trials, and the thousand other hindrances to justice; doctors consider all that as an accurately working part of the social machine, and look only to the abstract question. A man who kills his wife ought to be hung, they think; most people have an instinctive feeling to the same effect, because the fact appeals directly to the sense of natural justice. But the doctors go a step further: not only do they have the natural feeling, but, being accustomed to surgical operations, they have also a feeling that they should be perfectly willing to *officiate* in the matter, if no one else were at hand, and that by the mode least painful to the subject. They are terrible slashers. But perhaps their cool mode of thinking contributes, on the whole, to the health of the body politic, no less than their science does to that of the body individual. At all events, however much any one may differ with Dr. Gardner on this and other points, there will be no difference as to the fact of his having written a very readable volume.

The American in Paris. By JOHN SANDERSON. In two volumes. Third edition. Philadelphia: Carey & Hart. 1847.

Since these letters were originally published in 1835, they have had many imitators, some of them displaying much ability; yet, and also after a lapse of more than ten years, which is

a long immortality for such sketches, they have lost none of their original excellence. If it be lawful to use two words utterly outworn, we may express in them a sufficiently comprehensive criticism for a brief notice, and call these volumes "graphic" and "racy." They are picturesque, brilliant, sparkling—everything that is animated. To read them is like seeing fireworks. And yet they fatigue and cloy us. The intense ebullience of the fancy, which is their most remarkable characteristic, affects us, we know not why, sadly and even painfully. We seem to be brought in contact with a burning soul, that is consuming its over sensitive and excitable tenement. The *vis animi* is wearing out the body. After reading a few pages one feels heated and feverish. In this respect these letters are in marked contrast with those of Dr. Gardner, just noticed: they are more brilliant, but not so cheerful. It may be, however, that in this respect our perceptions are too delicate. For those who can bear such writing there is drollery enough, as well as suggestiveness, in these two volumes, to stimulate them for a month. "Here, on the *Boulevard Poissonniere*, or near it, resides Mr. —, of New Jersey; he has been sent over (hapless errand!) to convert these French people to Christianity. He is a very clever man, and we will ask if he is yet alive: the journals of this morning say three or four missionaries have been eaten up by the Sumatras." This and a thousand other *bon-bons* are in the very spirit of a Parisian *feuilletonist*. One cannot avoid a momentary smile at the absurdity of the idea, though Mr. — may have done a great deal of good in Paris, notwithstanding.

The Boys' Winter Book: Descriptive of the Season, Scenery, Rural Life, and Country Amusements. By THOMAS MILLER. Harper & Brothers.

It makes one almost sad to see how much better boys are cared for now than they used to be, especially during the annual holidays that are just past. This little volume is another evidence of the increased attention that is paid them. It is very neatly printed, and the wood cuts are well executed. Mr. Miller evidently loves children, and has also excellent taste in matters of literature, anecdote, &c. Our only fault with him is that he writes down *too far*, and is a little childish and goodyish at times, which boys do not like half so well as strong manly writing, that says what it has to say in plain words, and leaves their own active fancies to supply the coloring. Nothing offends their pride more than to be played baby with: they always feel that they are not appreciated, and that their teacher, who approaches them in that way, must be weak in perception. But so it is through life; the pride of the old stands opposed to that of the young:

"Crabbed age and youth
Cannot live together;"

and when there comes a young genius, who lives more in a month than others in a year, the proud world is seldom ready to acknowledge him till the struggle of life is past. Then it honors him for bravely dying.

The Lesson of Life, and other Poems. By GEORGE H. BAKER. Philadelphia: George S. Appleton, 148 Chesnut street. 1848.

A very modestly attired little volume, containing several very gracefully written pieces, betokening good sense, a kind heart, and a genial fancy. The longest piece has many passages of truly poetic description, and is nowhere marred by the affectations of style, which are the fashion of the day with many young gentlemen who presume to come before the world in the character of poets.

The Pictorial History of England. Harper & Brothers.

The republication of this great work is drawing to a conclusion, it having reached the thirty-third number, the whole being to be completed in about forty. It is fairly printed in ample two-column pages, and the engravings very respectable. The usefulness and interest of the work are too obvious to need a comment. It is a compilation from all sorts of histories, and presents a view not only of the progress of the government but also of the people, their religion, manners and customs, national industry, general condition, and gradual advancement in literature, science, and the fine arts. For those who read history only for their own gratification and mental improvement, and not to supply themselves with arms to be used in political or professional employments, such a work must supply a long-felt desideratum. For, in respect of the most picturesque parts of English history, we have hitherto relied more upon the old dramatists and the modern novelists than upon Hume and his successors: Shakspeare and Sir Walter Scott have in this sense been our best historians.

We have not had time to examine the tone and merit of the compilation, but it is fair to presume that it is of similar excellence with the many works tending to popularize learning and spread the love of knowledge which have issued from the same press in London; and if so, it is a work which cannot fail in this country of doing good service among the people. It is attractive and will be read, and many who are drawn into reading it will find how many of the noisiest social fancies of the present day which claim to be great discoveries are only new developments of the one Adam, and are in fact as old as the hills. It will lead to reflection, and that is a habit

which, in feverish and fighting times like these, all true men must be glad to see encouraged in every possible way.

Thomson's Seasons; and Goldsmith's Poems. Both Illustrated with Engravings by the Etching Club. Harper & Brothers. 1848.

To find these two familiar friends arrayed in dresses of such elegance, is like meeting an every-day acquaintance in a ball-room: they are so fine one scarcely recognizes them. Yesterday they lay in our chamber, soiled and rusty—one, sooth to tell, with his coat entirely torn off his back; to-day we behold them in blue and gold, and with their pages filled with elegant engravings. For our own part, we feel constrained and awkward in conversing with them in their new attire; but if there were any young lady friend, or relative, a cousin for example, upon whom we desired them to make a favorable impression, we could not present them to her in more attractive costume. They would surely be welcome guests in any parlor.

The *Seasons*, especially, is as charming a book as one could offer to a lady. It is such a beautiful work of art, so gentle and refining, so well fitted to cause those lovely in themselves to perceive the loveliness of the world around them, and thus to exist in a larger and more various sphere of enjoyment. One cannot but rejoice in the republication of so delightful a book in such a garb. Here in the rough outside of life, in the struggles of business and the coarse contacts of the gross and selfish, one almost fears sometimes that all the refinement of the world is vanishing out of it—that ladies are no longer sensitive to the music of the poets, and have determined to favor only the victors in those less severe and less exacting conflicts that occur in wars on fields of battle. The publication of these handsome editions is a proof that they have not forgotten how to estimate the greatness of those who conquer in ideal regions, as well as of those who dwell wholly in the actual.

Goldsmith would be less one's choice for such a purpose than Thomson, he having been obliged to see so much of the worse part of the world in his youth, that he never quite recovered of it; yet the *Deserted Village* is excellent reading. Every one knows that "*nihil quod tetigit quod non ornavit*:"—it is refreshing to see that he is at last beautified himself, more according to his deserts than he usually was in his lifetime.

Horæ Biblicæ Quotidianæ. Daily Scripture Readings. By the late THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D., L.L.D. In three volumes.—Vol. I. Harper & Brothers. 1848.

This volume forms a number in Dr. Chalmers'

Posthumous Works, now in course of publication by the Harpers. The second work of the series is entitled "*Horæ Biblicæ Sabbaticæ; or Sabbath Meditations on the Holy Scriptures.*" The third is called "*Theological Institutes*;" the fourth is the author's "*Lectures on Butler's Analogy*;" the fifth embraces "*Discourses.*" We mention the names of the forthcoming volumes for the convenience of many of our readers, who may wish to make themselves acquainted with one of the most distinguished theological writers of his time. The publishers promise also a *Life of Dr. Chalmers*, by his son-in-law Dr. Hanna, Editor of the North British Review.

The Bethel Flag: a Series of Short Discourses to Seamen. By GARDINER SPRING, D.D., Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church of the City of New-York. New-York: Baker & Scribner. 1848.

It is unnecessary to examine the literary merits of a series of discourses addressed to seamen by a clergyman whose writings are so highly esteemed by his denomination as Dr. Spring. They are characterized by his usual plainness and sincerity of style, and hence must have, aside from their pious uses, a tendency to improve the minds of the many readers they will of course find, among the class for whom they are intended.

The American Musical Times. A Gazette Devoted to Music, Literature, The Fine Arts, and the Drama. Henry C. Watson, Editor. New-York: W. B. Taylor, 114 Nassau street.

This is the title of the seventh number of a new weekly paper devoted, as its name imports, chiefly to music. Mr. Watson is very well known in the city as an accomplished musician and an able writer on all topics connected with the art. The series thus far has been decidedly the most interesting literary and musical *melange* we have ever seen, and if it is continued with the same spirit the work must surely succeed. The editor-promises a series of articles on Instrumentation, to be edited by Mr. George Loder: these will of course be both interesting and valuable to musical students.

The present number of the paper is in mourning on account of the death of Mendelssohn, who was the greatest of the cotemporary composers, and whose grandest work, the oratorio of *Elijah*, was successfully performed in our city, last month, by our best choral society, the American Musical-Institute, under Mr. Loder's direction.